The University of Chicago
Libraries

NOTES ON ST LUKE AND THE ACTS

By ALEX. PALLIS

Price Three Shillings

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
EDINBURGH GLASGOW LEIPZIG COPENHAGEN
NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE CAPETOWN
BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS SHANGHAI
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
1928

NOTES ON ST
AND THE
CHAC

By ALEX. PA

OXFORD UNIVERS
EDINBURGH GLASGOW LEIP
NEW YORK TORONTO MELBO
BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADR
LONDON: HUMPHRE
1928

N ST LUKE

HE ACTS OF

CAGO LIBRARIES

X. PALLIS

IVERSITY PRESS

W LEIPZIG COPENHAGEN

MELBOURNE CAPETOWN

TA MADRAS SHANGHAI

MPHREY MILFORD

1928

THE LIBRARY OF CHICAGO LUTHERAN

It has been well said that a new theory, if eventually proved true, has often to run through three phases. In the first place, every one exclaims that the theory is not true; then, that it is contrary to religion; lastly, that everybody knew it long ago.

SIR ROBERT BALL.

BS3596 .P2

Printed in Great Britain

839158

THE following pages conclude the series of suggestions which I have ventured to contribute towards the elucidation of the canonical historical books of the New Testament.

My intention when I embarked in my Scriptural studies was to extend them so as to embrace St Paul's genuine Epistles, namely the Corinthians, Galatians, Thessalonians, and Philemon. But this section bristles with difficulties surpassing those encountered in the Gospels; such in fact as I in view of my age and other drawbacks cannot hope to surmount.

As an example of such difficulties I may touch upon a grave error in 1Cor.7-37. This verse runs thus: *ὃς δὲ ἕστηκεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἑδραῖος μὴ ἔχων ἀνάγκην, ἐξουσίαν δὲ ἔχει περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου θελήματος καὶ τοῦτο κέκρικεν ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ καρδίᾳ, τηρεῖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ παρθένον, καλῶς ποιήσει*, and indicates that in the apostolic times there existed fathers who possessed power to enforce single life upon their daughters. Not only is this incredible by itself, but the fact also of no such question being hinted at elsewhere is unaccountable, for considering its social importance we should have expected to find it raising a storm of impassioned controversy. What is the explanation? I believe this, that the original word in the above sentence was not *παρθένον* but *παρθενίαν*, *virginity*, a term which could equally well apply to men as to women. With this correction its purport is: *But if any man be unshakable in his own mind and indifferent as to what the world may think* (see my note on Apoc.3-17), *and being master of his own will decide to preserve his virginity, that man will do well so to act.* Nor does the mischief stop at the corruption of *παρθενίαν*, for a good part

3319

of the seventh chapter has been organically recast so as to harmonize with *παρθένον*.

This is another (see my note on Lk 22-19) particularly regrettable erratum, for by the textual changes it effected it must occasionally have incited naïve young women to renounce the world and parents to incarcerate in nunneries recalcitrant or inconvenient daughters.

ST LUKE

1-1. Ἐπειδή περ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, ἔδοξε κἀμοὶ, παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς, καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι, κράτιστε Θεόφιλε, ἵνα ἐπιγνῷς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν. I believe that St Luke's thought was essentially this: Though many have previously tried their hand at composing a history of our faith as told by the original eye-witnesses and co-workers, still I think it desirable to address to you an account of my own. It is the outcome of an exhaustive investigation of all the facts, and will serve I expect to confirm the trustworthiness of that instruction which you received at your conversion.

ἀνατάξασθαι. Origen and other expositors take the preposition in the sense of *again*. But this is untenable, for in πολλοὶ St Luke no doubt included all previous historians, whereas Origen's interpretation must imply that they in turn were preceded by yet other compilers. The preposition seems to me to possess no particular force but to have been added by analogy with ἀναγράφω. Cf. Arrian. Prooem. (quoted by Liddell and Scott) ὅσα ἄμφω ξυνέγραψαν, ταῦτα ἐγὼ ἀναγράφω. Origen at this place τῶν ἐλθόντων ἐπὶ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῶν εὐαγγελίων. Polyb. 1-1 τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν ἀναγράφουσι τὰς πράξεις. Epic. Herod. 35 τῶν περὶ φύσεως ἀναγεγραμμένων. Josep. BJ. 1-1 διηγήματα ἀναγράφουσιν. In my note on Rom. 1-11, I have adduced other similar analogical additions in ἐπιποθῶ (Rom. 1-11), συνμαρτυρῶ (Rom. 2-15), ἐπίγνωσις (Rom. 3-20), ὑπερνικῶ (Rom. 8-37), ἐμμαθεῖν (Soph. Ant. 175), formed after ἐπιθυμῶ, συνηγορῶ, ἐπιστήμη, ὑπερέχω or ὑπερβάλλω, ἐννοῆσαι.

Nor do I think that τάξασθαι means *to set up in order*, as some editors accept conformably to the Vulgate *ordinare*, for this disagrees with Luke's poor estimate of the performances of his predecessors; it merely means *to compile*, as ἀνατάξασθαι also does in Iren. 3-21-2 τοὺς τῶν προγεγονότων προφητῶν πάντας ἀνατάξασθαι λόγους.

τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν. *Which have been accomplished among us.* Euthymius, however, in saying τῶν βεβαιωθέντων ἐν ἡμῖν evidently takes πληροφορῶ in its alternative sense of *to inform*, and the writers

of several documents, which give ἡμῖν and not ἐν ἡμῖν, must no doubt have understood πεπληροφορημένων in the same way. Sophocles cites several examples from the fifth century and one from the seventh of πληροφορῶ as = *to inform*, and of πληροφορία from the fourth century as = *information*. The same is the traditional sense of both the verb and the noun in MGk. In the New Testament we find Rom.4-21 πληροφορηθεὶς in the sense of βεβαιωθεὶς and Rom.14-5 πληροφορείσθω = *let him be advised* or *enlightened*. The reading ἐν ἡμῖν, which is universally adopted, is not against Euthymius's version. Jannaris § 1562 'The metaphorical (instrumental) use of ἐν becomes considerably frequent in Hellenistic times, notably among Biblical writers and their imitators, who often go so far as to place it before any dative, a phenomenon which points to Hebrew influence, and moreover indicates the retreat of the loose dative.' Cf.Mt 10-32 ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοί. 12-24 οὐκ ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια εἰμὴ ἐν τῷ Βεελζεβούλ. 14-2 αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ. 17-12 ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν. 1Cor.9-15 ἵνα οὕτω γένηται ἐν ἐμοί. Apoc.14-2 κιθαριζόντων ἐν ταῖς κιθάραις, and often; see my note on Rom.1-19. If Euthymius is right, τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων καθὼς παρέδοσαν would virtually express the same as τῶν παραδεδομένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων καθὼς παρέδοσαν. And I am inclined to think that he is right, for, as observed by previous scholars, Luke's introduction somewhat recalls that of Thucydides, and τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων καθὼς παρέδοσαν appears to imitate the style of τὸν πόλεμον ὡς ἐπολέμησαν. There are other passages in Luke which must have been inspired by his classical schooling. In v.3 παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς was borrowed from Demos.285 παρηκολουθηκότα τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς (= ἄνωθεν) and 423 ἀκριβέστατα εἰδὼς ἐγὼ καὶ παρηκολουθηκὼς ἅπασι. Acts 17-21 Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πάντες εἰς οὐδὲν ἕτερον εὐκαίρουν ἢ λέγειν τι ἢ ἀκούειν τι καινότερον was equally taken from Demos. 43 περιϊόντες πυνθάνεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ἀγορὰν Λέγεταί τι καινόν; and the address ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι in Acts 17-22 smacks also of Demosthenes. Moreover, Acts 17-17 διελέγετο ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ κατὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν πρὸς τοὺς παρατυγχάνοντας and 17-18 ξένων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι are reminiscences of the history of Socrates. If Luke was thus imbued with Attic literature, he must have known by heart the first lines of

Thucydides, and it is most likely that consciously or unconsciously he has partly reproduced their style.

1-2. **καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ'ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου.** No comma should be marked before these words, for they are closely connected with *πεπληροφορημένων*, or with *ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν* as some editors contend; the comma creates the impression as though they were parenthetical.

1-3. **καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι.** An obvious imitation either of Thuc.2-1 *γέγραπται δὲ ἑξῆς* and 5-26-1 *γέγραφε δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ὁ αὐτὸς Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ἑξῆς*, or more probably of the beginning of Thucydides, which must originally have run *ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων ἑξῆς* (omitted in our Mss) *ὡς ἐπολέμησαν*.

1-6. **δίκαιοι ἀμφότεροι ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ.** A variant *ἐνώπιον* (here as well as at v. 8. 24-19. Mk 2-12) shows that *ἐναντίον* and *ἐνώπιον* are synonymous, so that *ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ* is identical with *ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*, which again is a periphrasis for a dative, no doubt a Hebraism; cf. 4-7 *ἐὰν προσκυνήσῃς ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ*. 1-74 *λατρεύειν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ* (reproducing the preceding *αὐτῷ*, see my note). 10-21 *ἐγένετο εὐδοκία ἔμπροσθέν σου*. Acts 6-5 *ἤρεσεν ὁ λόγος ἐνώπιον τοῦ πλήθους*. 1Jn 3-22 *τὰ ἀρεστὰ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ*, etc.; it is a usage very common in the Septuagint, cf. Dan. (LXX) 9-10 *ἔδωκας ἐνώπιον Μωσῆ*. Numb.32-4 *γῆν ἣν παραδέδωκεν κύριος ἐνώπιον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ*, etc. See my note on Rom.12-17. Therefore *δίκαιοι ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ = δίκαιοι τῷ θεῷ*. Regarding the addition of *θεῷ* or *θεοῦ* Coraes in his Atakta vol.2 p.156 explains that it stands for a superlative degree, and quotes Ps.79-11 *τὰς κέδρους τοῦ θεοῦ = ὑψηλοτάτας*. Jon.3-3 *Νινευὴ πόλις μεγάλη τῷ θεῷ = μεγίστη*. Acts 7-20 *ἀστεῖος τῷ θεῷ = ἀστειότατος*. Add Protev.Jac.10 *ἀμίαντος τῷ θεῷ*. Similarly Lk 1-15 *μέγας ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου*. Gen.10-9 *γίγας κυνηγὸς ἐναντίον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ*. 1Kings 16-12 *ἀγαθὸς ὁράσει κυρίῳ = most handsome to look at*. Sir. 18-26 *ταχινὰ ἔναντι κυρίου = ταχινότατα*. Likewise 2Cor.11-2 *ζηλῶ ὑμᾶς θεοῦ ζήλῳ*. Coraes further points out that in MGk *θεὸς* when combined with adjectives raises them to superlatives, like *θεότρελος, θεότυφλος, θεόγυμνος, utterly mad, totally blind, stark naked*. Accordingly *δίκαιοι ἀμφότεροι ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ* of our passage simply means *ἀμφότεροι δικαιότατοι, both most righteous*.

1-15. **μέγας ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου.** I.e. *μέγιστος*; see preceding note.

1-16. πολλοὺς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπιστρέψει ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν. Καὶ αὐτὸς προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει Ἠλίου ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων. Some deplorable confusion seems to have occurred at this place. For (*προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον*) *αὐτοῦ* must refer to the Messiah whose *πρόδρομος* John was to be, whereas as the text stands it states that John was to be *πρόδρομος* not of the Messiah but of God, an impossible conception. It seems to me that where we have now *πολλοὺς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπιστρέψει ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν* there stood originally a reference to Christ, the more so as that sentence states nothing different in substance to *ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων*. I cannot believe that Luke was such a casual writer as the present text of the above clause makes him out.

1-17. ἐπιστρέψαι ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων. I.e. *εἰς φρόνησιν δικαίων*. Cf. 4-1 *ἤγετο ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*. Rom.1-23 *ἤλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνος*. 1-25 *μετήλλαξαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει*, etc. Jannaris § 1565 'during the period of confusion *ἐν* was used very frequently for *εἰς*. Lk 9-46 *εἰσῆλθεν διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς*. 23-42 *ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου*. Ael.4-18 *κατῆλθε Πλάτων ἐν Σικελίᾳ*, etc.'

1-24. συνέλαβεν Ἐλισάβεθ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ περιέκρυβεν ἑαυτὴν μῆνας πέντε, λέγουσα ὅτι οὕτω μοι πεποίηκεν ὁ κύριος ἐν ἡμέραις αἷς ἐπεῖδεν ἀφελεῖν τὸ ὄνειδός μου. It was a matter of great pride and exultation for Elizabeth to have conceived, especially after such a prolonged disappointment, and she would have been eager to proclaim her pregnancy to all her relatives and friends; if she kept back the joyful news, she must have had an imperative reason. What was that reason? It ought evidently to be indicated in the words *οὕτω μοι πεποίηκεν ὁ κύριος κτλ*; but as the text now stands they contain no reason. I suspect that *πεποίηκεν ὁ κύριος* is a misreading of *μεμήνυκεν ὁ κύριος*, namely, that by a divine message Elizabeth was commanded to keep her condition secret for a time. This command is not explicitly mentioned in our Gospel, but it figured probably in the narrative whence Luke drew, and he may have thought that, it being a well-known part of the legend, it sufficed if he merely explained how it happened that Elizabeth remained silent for five months. There are other instances where it is said that certain events were not divulged at the precise moment of their occurrence; as mysteries (see my note on Rom.11-25)

they were reserved until the pre-appointed time, in this case perhaps until Mary first should become acquainted with the great event. So in Protev.Jac.20-4 a voice from heaven tells Salome, who had assisted at the birth of the Lord, Σαλώμη, μὴ ἀναγγείλῃς ὅσα εἶδες παράδοξα ἕως οὗ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ὁ παῖς. Cf. also Evang.Thom. 11 διετήρει (Μαρία) ἐν αὐτῇ τὰ μυστήρια ἃ ἔβλεπεν αὐτὸν (τὸν Ἰησοῦν) ποιοῦντα. Lk 2-19 Μαριὰμ πάντα συνετήρει τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα, συνβάλλουσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς. Dan.7-28 τὸ ῥῆμα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου ἐστήριξα. XII Patr.Lev.6 συνετήρουν τοὺς λόγους τούτους ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου. 8-19 ἔκρυψα καί γε τοῦτο ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου καὶ οὐκ ἀνήγγειλα αὐτό τινι ἀνθρώπῳ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

περιέκρυβεν. An imperfect. Sophocles registers several examples of κρύβω = κρύπτω. It is the MGk form.

1-28. κεχαριτωμένη. A demotic form for χαρίεσσα. Cf. Schol.Arist. Achar.867 ἐπιχαρίτως ἀντὶ τοῦ κεχαριτωμένως. Hesychius (quoted by Wetstein) χαρίεντα, κεχαριτωμένα. The Vulgate correctly *gratiâ plena*. In this sense still alive in MGk as χαριτωμένη; Vlákhos 'χαριτωμένος, *charmant, plein de grâces*,' with which Esth.5-2 τὸ πρόσωπόν σου χαρίτων μεστὸν and 4 Mac.8-3 ἑπτὰ ἀδελφοὶ ἐν παντὶ χαρίεντες may be compared. Some expositors in rendering *who has met with kindness* (from God) have been misled by v.30 εὗρες χάριν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ. I should translate *gracious* or *gentle lady*.

1-35. διό. A variant διότι. See my note on Acts 20-26.

1-39. ἀναστᾶσα δὲ Μαριὰμ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἐπορεύθη. When a sudden or immediate action is told, ἀναστὰς or ἐγερθεὶς is added as if one had been quietly sitting and unexpectedly rose up to activity. Examples exist in abundance. Cf. 10-25. 15-18. 15-20. 17-19. Acts 5-6. 8-26. 11-28. Mk 16-9. Mt 9-19. But from their frequent use these participles are added even when an ordinary movement is started. The same exactly is the case in MGk, which in similar cases employs σηκώνουμαι = ἐγείρομαι. So this idiom has nothing to do with Hebrew, as is supposed; if it exists in Hebrew, it is a coincidence.

1-45. καὶ μακαρία ἡ πιστεύσασα ὅτι ἔσται τελείωσις τοῖς λελαλημένοις αὐτῇ παρὰ κυρίου. Mary expressed at first the same doubts as Zechariah when the divine message was delivered to her, and there was no occasion for her faith being particularly extolled. Besides, when she had

been called by Elizabeth God's mother, the highest possible praise was already bestowed upon her. I believe this verse does not come from Luke, but was an enthusiast's marginal exclamation prompted by *ἰδοὺ ἡ δούλη κυρίου, γένοιτό μοι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου* of v. 38.

1-58. **ἐμεγάλυνε κύριος τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτῆς.** The emprotheton is equivalent to a dative, as it is also in 10-36 *ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος μετ' αὐτοῦ*. See my note on Acts 9-39.

1-72. **ποιῆσαι ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ μνησθῆναι διαθήκης.** Editors have gone astray in taking these infinitives as denoting purpose. The words *μετὰ τῶν πατέρων* show quite clearly that *ποιῆσαι* has reference to the past, and therefore cannot denote purpose. In imitation of a Septuagint or sacred style which makes an abuse of the infinitive, *ποιῆσαι* and *μνησθῆναι* stand for participles; cf. Ruth 4-14 *εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὃς οὐ κατέλυσέ* (= *ὁ μὴ καταλύσας*) *σοι τὸν ἀγχιστέα καὶ καλέσαι* (= *καλέσας*) *τὸ ὄνομά σου*. Dan. (LXX) 3-29 *ἠνομήσαμεν ἀποστῆναι* (= *ἀποστάντες*). And with participial force are they joined with *εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ* of v.68; in ordinary style the phrasing would have proceeded thus: *εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ποιήσας* (reference to the past) *ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ μνησθεὶς* (reference to the present) *διαθήκης*. Cf. Jud.13-17 *εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ ἐξουδενώσας*. Ps.71-18 *εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ποιῶν θαυμάσια*. Luke no doubt must have considered the Septuagint style indispensable in a solemn canticle such as Zechariah's; but in point of eccentricity his construction of this passage is the limit. This comment equally applies to v. 54.

1-74. **λατρεύειν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ.** In my note on 1-6 I have referred to *ἐνώπιον* with a genitive as another form of the dative. In this passage also *ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ* is nothing else than a periphrasis of *αὐτῷ* and merely reiterates the preceding dative. For similar repetitions cf. Enoch 13 *ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνήγγειλα αὐτοῖς*. 14 *τοῖς ἀνθρώποις λαλεῖν ἐν αὐτοῖς*. The Syr. Sinaiticus, however, omits *αὐτῷ*, the Lewes translation rendering *that we might serve before him in uprightness*; on the other hand, one Greek Ms (see Soden) omits *ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ*, the learned transcriber possibly having thought that, besides sounding too barbarous, it was superfluous after *αὐτῷ*.

1-77. **τοῦ δοῦναι γνῶσιν σωτηρίας τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν.** A

sentence too concise and peculiar in formation, such as Luke is fond of when he affects the Septuagint style, but its drift is clear enough, namely, *so that he may bestow upon his people wisdom* (good sense) *leading to the remission of sins and to* the acquirement of *salvation.* In full *σωτηρίας* would be *εἰς περιποίησιν σωτηρίας*, as in 1Thes.5-9. With *δοῦναι γνῶσιν σωτηρίας* compare Rom.2-20 *μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας.*

γνῶσιν. The same as *φρόνησιν, sagacity, thoughtfulness.* Cf. Rom. 11-33 *βάθος σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως θεοῦ.* The same is probably the meaning in Lk.11-52 *κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως.* For the converse to this cf. 1Pet.2-15 *ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἀγνωσίαν.* The word *γνῶσις* is still alive in demotic MGk in the form of *γνώση*, generally quoted by purists as *γνῶσις.* Vlákhos v. *γνῶσις* '*ἔχει γνῶσιν, il est très-intelligent, c'est un homme sensé.*' And *γνωστικὸς* is the *sagacious, prudent,* and *tactful* man.

1-79. *εἰρήνης. Of salaam* or *σωτηρίας.* See my note on Apoc. 7-10.

2-11. *σωτὴρ, ὅς ἐστι Χριστός. A saviour, that is to say* (see my note on Jn 18-38), *Christ.* I have explained in my note on Rom.10-6 that Luke being unacquainted with Hebrew (see my note on 11-42) imagined that it was with *Μεσσίας* that the word *σωτὴρ* was related and not with *Ἰησοῦς.* Another notable instance of this confusion occurs in Acts 4-10 *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ οὗτος παρέστηκεν ὑγιής. Καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενὶ ἡ σωτηρία, οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομα ἔστιν ἕτερον ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι.* The confusion started with the Gnostics, who are alluded to in Iren.1-31 *Χριστοῦ ὃν καὶ σωτῆρα λέγουσιν.*

2-15. *τὸ ῥῆμα.* Neither the version *thing* nor the version *saying* quite correspond with *ῥῆμα.* It is the Semitic *dabar*, explained by Miss Harrison in Themis p. 82 to signify both *word* and *deed.* Luke of course took it from its translation in the Septuagint; cf. Gen.22-16 *ἐποίησας τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο*, and often. I do not know whether the English language possesses an analogous term; perhaps *matter* would be the nearest.

τὸ γεγονός. The English version here gives *that is come to pass,* whereas at Acts 10-37 *τὸ γενόμενον* is translated by *which was published.* I should suggest at both places *which has been bruited.*

2-17. *ἐγνώρισαν.* The Vulgate *cognoverunt.* So also Euthymius '*ἐπληροφορήθησαν.*'

2-19. *συνετήρει.* See my note on 1-24.

συνβάλλουσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς. The same as *συντιθεῖσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς*, cf. 1-66 *ἔθεντο πάντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν*. For *βάλλω* of course often signifies *to put*, as always in MGk; so Mk 7-33 *ἔβαλε τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὦτα αὐτοῦ*. How the English translators came to render *and pondered them in her heart* I cannot follow; it should be *and laid them up together in her heart*, in the same way as *ἔθεντο* of v. 66 has been rendered by *laid up*.

2-32. **φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν.** *A light for lifting the blindness of the heathen.* Euthymius '*εἰς ἀνάβλεψιν τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν τετυφλωμένων τῇ πλάνῃ.*' The sentence with such an interpretation tallies with what has inspired it, i. e. Isa.42-6 *ἔδωκά σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς τυφλῶν* combined with 49-8 *λέγοντα τοῖς ἐν τῷ σκότει ἀνακαλυφθῆναι.*

2-34. **οὗτος κεῖται εἰς σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον.** An allusion to the disputes and discussions for and against, which were proceeding in Lk's time concerning the claims made as to Jesus being the Messiah. Cf. Protev.Jac.20 *εἰσῆλθεν ἡ μαῖα καὶ εἶπε τῇ Μαριὰμ Σχημάτισον σεαυτήν, οὐ γὰρ μικρὸς ἀγὼν περίκειται περὶ σοῦ.* Orig.Jerem.15-4 (Preuschen's Antil. p. 5) *οἶμοι ἐγώ, μῆτερ, ὡς τίνα με ἔτεκες ἄνδρα δικαζόμενον καὶ διακρινόμενον ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ*; The expression was probably borrowed from Josh.4-6 *ἵνα ὑπάρχωσιν ὑμῖν οὗτοι εἰς σημεῖον κείμενον διὰ παντός.*

2-35. **σοῦ δὲ αὐτῆς τὴν ψυχὴν διελεύσεται ῥομφαία.** From Ps.104-18 (quoted by Wetstein) *σίδηρον διῆλθεν ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ.* Cf. also Job 20-25 *διεξέλθοι διὰ σώματος αὐτοῦ βέλος.*

ὅπως ἄν. In my note on Rom.15-24 in commenting upon *ὡσὰν* I have observed 'Generally written *ὡς ἄν*; but it should be written as one word, for it is the same as *ὅταν* with *ὅτε* replaced by its equivalent *ὡς*. In MGk *σὰν* (from *ὡσὰν*) = *ὅταν*. A further development is *ὁπωσὰν* of Acts 3-19 and probably Lk 2-35. Cf. also *ἐπὰν, ἐπειδάν.*'

ὁπωσὰν ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν ἐκ πολλῶν καρδιῶν διαλογισμοί. This may be rendered either by *that thoughts out of many hearts may be revealed* or by *that thoughts out of many hearts may be enlightened.* But inasmuch as Mary's anguish is eventually to prove a benefit to mankind, the latter version seems preferable, except that *ἐκ* should be eliminated, as it is in D, in the Syr.Sinaiticus, in several old Latin and other versions; with this elimination the meaning would become *so that the thoughts of many hearts*, so that many minds, *may be enlightened.* The

Latin translator of 1Act.Pil.16-2, which is a parallel passage, has rendered *ut revelerentur cogitationes multorum cordium*, and therefore he found no ἐκ in his Greek text.

2-38. **λύτρωσιν Ἰερουσαλήμ.** A scribe, moved by the anti-Jewish passions of his time, would not allow that Ἰσραὴλ(ιηλ), which appears as a variant in our Mss, would ever be redeemed, and so he changed it into Ἰερουσαλὴμ(ιλημ).

3-15. **προσδοκῶντος δὲ τοῦ λαοῦ, ἀπεκρίνατο ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγων.** What were the people expecting? Plummer asks. There is nothing in the context pointing to an expectation. Such explanations, as for instance Weiss's 'sie waren in Spannung, nämlich in folge der Gerichtsverkündung des Täufers (v.9),' are rather far-fetched. I suggest *προσακούοντος*, the preposition being added by analogy with *προσέχω*; see my note on *ἀνατάξασθαι* of 1-1. Cf. 19-11 *ἀκουόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ταῦτα, προσθεὶς εἶπε.* 20-45 *ἀκούοντος δὲ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, εἶπε.*

3-18. **παρακαλῶν.** *Instructing.* Commenting upon *παρακλήσεως* in my note on Rom.15-4, I stated that the context demands the meaning of *instruction*, which *παράκλησις* seems to possess equally in Acts 13-15 and 1Thes.2-3; also in Lk 3-18.

3-23. **ὡς ἐνομίζετο.** Expunged by Scholten (see Baljon).

4-1. **ἤγετο ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.** The AV correctly *into the wilderness*, see my note on 1-17; but the Revisers have substituted *in the wilderness*.

4-7. **ἐὰν προσκυνήσῃς ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ.** The AV correctly renders *if thou wilt worship me*, for the emprotheton is equivalent to a dative, as explained in my note on 1-6; but the Revisers have again in this instance vitiated the sentence by altering it into *if thou wilt worship before me*.

4-18. **κηρῦξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν, ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει.** Isa.61-1, which Luke quotes, runs thus: *ἀπέσταλκέ με ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν, κηρῦξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν.* So *ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει* of our passage corresponds with *ἀπέσταλκέ με ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν* of Isaiah, the reference being to those in pain or distress, as is also in Ps.146-3 *ὁ ἰώμενος τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν* and in Jer.3-22 *ἰάσομαι τὰ συντρίμματα ὑμῶν.* To such unhappy people the relief brought is thus *ἴασις*, and not *ἄφεσις*, which is only appropriate to the case of prisoners. Instead therefore of *ἐν ἀφέσει*, it seems to me that we should write *ἐν ἰάσει.*

A similar misreading exists in Hebr.9-22 *χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις*; read *ἴασις*, the allusion evidently being to a cure by bloodletting. Further, in Acts 3-16 *πίστις* has been substituted for *ἴασις*; see my note. Perhaps, however, *ἐν ἀνέσει* is a more probable correction, as being palaeographically nearer. Cf. 2Cor.7-5 *οὐδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν, ἀλλ'ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι.* 8-13 *οὐ γὰρ ἵνα ἄλλοις ἄνεσις, ὑμῖν θλῖψις.* 2Thes.1-7 *τοῖς θλιβομένοις ἄνεσίν.*

4-22. **ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ;** This expression of admiration on the part of the congregation is discordant with the next sentence *καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς Πάντως ἐρεῖτέ μοι τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην Ἰατρέ, θεράπευσον σεαυτόν*, which indicates a hostile attitude and some sort of previous altercation. I surmise, therefore, that a lacuna exists before *καὶ εἶπε.*

4-36. **καὶ συνελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες Τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος, ὅτι (= ὃς) ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασι;** The version *this word* is wide of the mark. The combination of *ὁ λόγος οὗτος* is still alive in MGk in the form of *τοῦ λόγου του* as a respectful expression, which avoids *αὐτὸς* as too crude and corresponds to *his Honour* in English; it is frequently used ironically, as it is in this passage. Vlákhos v. *λόγος* '*τοῦ λόγου μετὰ τῶν κτητικῶν ἀντωνυμιῶν σου του μας = vous lui elle eux elles; τί λέγει τοῦ λόγου του; que dit ce Monsieur? κάτι μᾶς εἶπε καὶ τοῦ λόγου του* [*εἰρωνικῶς*], *écoutez ce que dit cet autre.*' It was likewise in Hellenistic times, and perhaps earlier. Sophocles v. *λόγος* 'With the genitive of the personal pronoun it forms a periphrastic personal pronoun. Sept.Reg.3-17 *διὰ στόματος λόγου μου.* Porph.Adm.170-7 *ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου ὑμῶν*, essentially = *ὑφ' ὑμῶν.*' Add 1Kings *ἤκουσα ἐν τῇ γῇ μου περὶ τοῦ λόγου σου*, which Origen in Cels.3-45 interprets *περὶ σοῦ.* Phil.4-17 *τὸν καρπὸν τὸν πλεονάζοντα εἰς λόγον ὑμῶν = εἰς ὑμᾶς.* Mart.Petr.5 *γυναῖκες τοῦ λόγου = ἐλλόγιμοι.* The nominative is encountered in Wisd.18-15 *ὁ παντοδύναμός σου λόγος = ὁ παντοδύναμος σύ.* Similarly Wisd.16-26 *τὸ ῥῆμά σου (= σὺ) τοὺς σοὶ πιστεύοντας διατηρεῖ.* Perhaps also in 1Kings18-8 *πονηρὸν ἐφάνη τὸ ῥῆμα ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς Σαοὺλ περὶ τοῦ λόγου τούτου*, i. e. *περὶ Δαυὶδ*, in MGk = *περὶ τοῦ λόγου του.* That this acceptation is correct is proved by *καὶ ἤρξαντο λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς τίς οὗτός ἐστιν ὃς καὶ*

ἁμαρτίας ἀφίησιν; of 7-49, the first part of which is parallel to the first part of our passage. Similar respectful expressions are the combinations with πνεῦμα, δύναμις, πρόσωπον, ὄνομα.

ὅτι = ὃς, as it stands in 7-49. See my notes on Rom.8-29 and Jn1-16.

5-2. ἔπλυνον τὰ δίκτυα. The variant ἀπέπλυνον in the form ἀπέπλυναν is strongly attested. That would be the MGk ξέπλαιναν (= ἐξέπλυνον, an imperfect), *they washed the salt water off their nets.* Tischendorf's ἔπλυναν is in any case wrong, for it is the aorist, whereas clearly the imperfect is required.

5-34. ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι, καὶ ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, τότε νηστεύσουσιν. The usual expression with Luke is to say ὅτε δὲ ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι, καὶ τότε νηστεύσουσιν, the particle καὶ being thus expletive. See my note on Acts 22-20.

6-10. ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου. *Stretch forth your hand.* So the English version; but it should rather be *stretch forth your arm*, χεὶρ often standing for *arm*. So also MGk, which likewise employs πόδι[ον] for σκέλος.

6-11. ἐπλήσθησαν ἀνοίας. Probably ἀνοίας is here used in the sense of ἁμαρτίας, as its synonym ἀφροσύνης occasionally is. Cf. XII Patr. Lev.7-3 ἀφροσύνην ἔπραξαν ἐν Ἰσραὴλ μιάναντες τὴν ἀδελφήν μου. Ecc. 7-26 ἀσεβοῦς ἀφροσύνην. Wisd.12-23 τοὺς ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ ζωῆς (=ἐν ἁμαρτωλῷ ζωῇ) βιώσαντας. Ps.48-11 ἄφρων καὶ ἄνους, etc. So ἀσύνετος often = ἁμαρτωλός. A variant ἀνομίας, recorded by Soden, probably is also due to its author considering that something like ἁμαρτίας was here required. Bentley likewise conjectured ἀνομίας. Or the original reading may have been ἀγνοίας, which so often occurs as a synonym of ἁμαρτίας. Cf. XII Patr.Zab.1-5 οὐ μνήσκομαι ὅτι παρανομίαν ἐποίησα πλὴν τὴν ἄγνοιαν ἣν ἐποίησα ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ. Lev.4-13 ἐὰν πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ἀγνοήσῃ καὶ γνωσθῇ αὐτοῖς ἡ ἁμαρτία. 1Esdr.8-72 αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἡμῶν ἐπλεόνασαν καὶ αἱ ἄγνοιαι ἡμῶν ὑπερήνεγκαν. Ezek.46-20 τὰ ὑπὲρ ἀγνοίας καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας. Dan.(LXX)4-29 αἱ ἁμαρτίαι μου καὶ αἱ ἄγνοιαί μου ἐπληρώθησαν καὶ ἐδεήθην ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀγνοιῶν μου. Acts And.Mat.12 ἄγνοιαν τοῦ διαβόλου, etc. Similarly ἀγνοῶ = ἁμαρτάνω; no doubt a Hebraism.

6-22. ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρόν. This phrase is still quite current in the form βγάζω (= ἐκβάλλω) κανενὸς κακὸ ὄνομα or simply βγάζω τὸ ὄνομα κανενὸς, which means *I bring forth* and make public *somebody's name as* that of a *bad* man. Byzantios the Lexicographer v.

ἐβγάζω [= ἐκβάλλω] ‘ ἔβγαλε τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κοριτσιοῦ [*of the girl*], δηλαδὴ ἐδυσφήμησε τὸ κορίτσι, a phrase almost identical with that of Deut. 22-19 ἐξήνεγκεν ὄνομα πονηρὸν ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένον, and with that of Lk 6-22 ὅταν ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρόν.’ Vlákhos v. ἐβγαίνω [= ἐκβαίνω] records the proverb καλλίτερα νὰ σοῦ βγῇ τὸ μάτι σου παρὰ νὰ σοῦ βγῇ τὸ ὄνομα, *better that thy eye should come out than that thy name should come out.* Therefore the version *they cast out* is an error, due to taking *βάλλω* in its classical sense, whereas Hellenistically often, and at present always, *βάλλω* is a synonym of *τίθημι*; cf. Mk 7-33 ἔβαλε τοὺς δακτύλους εἰς τὰ ὦτα, see my note on 2-19. Plummer with others has entirely misunderstood this sentence when he says ‘Throw your name contemptuously away, reject it with ignominy, as an evil thing. It is used of hissing an actor off the stage and otherwise dismissing with contempt.’

6-29. καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσῃς. Namely, let him strip you of everything, down to your very shirt. Compare the MGk τὸν ἄφισε μὲ τὸ πουκάμισο (= ὑποκάμισον), he took away all his belongings short of his shirt.

6-38. μέτρον καλὸν, πεπιεσμένον σεσαλευμένον ὑπερεκχυνόμενον. Euthymius ‘ εἰώθασι γὰρ οἱ καλῶς μετροῦντες τὸν σῖτον, ἐπιτιθέντες τῷ μοδίῳ τὰς χεῖρας, πιέζειν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ κάτω, καὶ [λακτίζοντας] σαλεύειν ἵνα συμπέσῃ, καὶ ἐπιβάλλειν ἵνα ὑπερεκχυθῇ.’ It is exactly the practice at the present time in certain bazaars in India where corn is sold by a measure of capacity. Luke has inverted the order of things by saying πεπιεσμένον σεσαλευμένον; it is the shaking that comes first. Luke, however, may not be responsible for the inversion, as there exists a variant which places σεσαλευμένον first. Weiss also is incorrect in saying ‘ durch Zusammendrücken oder durch Schütteln; ’ *oder* should be replaced by *und*.

6-48. οἰκοδομῆσθαι. Naber ᾠκοδομῆσθαι. But Jannaris § 716 ‘Initial οι remains, even in classical antiquity, but notably in post-classical antiquity, without augment.’ He also refers to Phryn. 131 ‘ᾠκοδόμηκεν διὰ τοῦ ωι ἄριστα ἐρεῖς, ἀλλ’οὐ διὰ τοῦ οι,’ which shows that in Phrynichus's time the unaugmented form was quite common; Meisterhans (Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften) states ‘ vom Verbum οἰκοδομέω findet sich viermal die augmentlose Form οἰκοδομημένοι.’

7-8. ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν τασσόμενος. I.e. ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν τεταγμένος. Cf. Diod.

16-11-15 *τοὺς ὑφ'ἡγεμονίας τεταγμένους*. There occur other examples where the present participle is employed for the perfect. Cf. Mt 23-35 *ὅπως ἔλθῃ ἐφ'ὑμᾶς πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον ἐκχυνόμενον*. Compare Mk 14-40 *ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν καταβαρυνόμενοι* with Lk 9-32 *βεβαρημένοι ὕπνῳ*.

Luke repeats here the error in Mt 8-9 *ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν*, which, as I have explained elsewhere, should be *ἐπὶ ἐξουσίαν*.

7-29. **πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἀκούσας καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν θεὸν βαπτισθέντες**. This should express the opposite to *οἱ νομικοὶ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς μὴ βαπτισθέντες* which follows; but the text does not express this thought. Instead of stating that the people and even publicans consented to be baptized in order to secure justification, it states oddly enough that it was God who obtained justification by their baptism; which is sheer blasphemy. The right reading could only have been either *ἐδικαιώθησαν*, or *ἐδικαιώσαντο*, or *ἐδικαίωσαν ἑαυτοὺς, τῷ θεῷ*. I think the last is the most probable reading, for besides conforming to the construction of *ἠθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς* it best accounts for the change of the dative into an accusative; when *ἑαυτοὺς* dropped out, the dative no longer accorded with *ἐδικαίωσαν* and the alteration followed as a matter of course. This guess is corroborated by the Syr. Sinaiticus, the rendering of which is *justified themselves to God*. Cf. 16-15 *δικαιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων* (= *τοῖς ἀνθρώποις*). Rom.3-20 *οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ*. 1Kings 12-7 *δικαιώσω ὑμᾶς ἐνώπιον κυρίου*. Ps.142-2 *οὐ δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ζῶν*.

7-30. **εἰς ἑαυτούς**. In my note on Rom.1-19 *φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς* I commented as follows: 'Jannaris § 1562 says "The metaphorical (instrumental) use of *ἐν* becomes considerably frequent in Hellenistic times, notably among Biblical writers and their imitators, who often go so far as to place it before any dative, a phenomenon which points to Hebrew influence and moreover indicates the retreat of the loose dative." The partiality to this idiom in consequence of its frequent appearance in the LXX eventually led to its being employed instead of the genitive with *ὑπό*. See note on 8-4. Cf. 1Cor.6-2 *ἐν ὑμῖν κρίνεται ὁ κόσμος*. Col.1-16 *ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα*. This further led to a most absurd abuse in that *ἐν αὐτῷ* was occasionally foisted by writers affecting a sacred style upon active verbs as a sort of repetition of the subject. So Eph.1-4 *ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ*. 1-9 *ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ* (= *ἣ προετέθη*

ὑπ'αὐτοῦ). 2-15 ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ. 2-16 ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ. Rom.1-24 ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς (Mss ἑαυτοῖς). 1-27 ἐν αὐτοῖς (some Mss give ἐν ἑαυτοῖς) ἀπολαμβάνοντες. XII Patr Sim. 6 ὁ θεὸς ἥξει ὡς ἄνθρωπος καὶ σώζων ἐν αὐτῷ τὸν Ἀδάμ. Col.2-15 θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ. Mart.Petr.7 ὁ κύριος θεμελιώσει ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ πλατυνεῖ ἐν αὐτῷ. Similarly 1Thes.1-5 ἐγενήθημεν ἐν ὑμῖν (read ἐν ἡμῖν). [Add Jn 13-32 ὁ θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ]. A further preposterous development was to substitute εἰς αὐτὸν for ἐν αὐτῷ. Cf. Lk 7-30 [our passage under discussion] ἠθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς (αὐτούς?). Eph.1-5 προορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς υἱοθεσίαν εἰς αὐτόν. Col.1-16 πάντα εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται, which repeats the foregoing ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα.' Since then my conviction has been strengthened that in our passage we must accordingly read εἰς αὐτοὺς and not the textual εἰς ἑαυτούς.

7-33. **μὴ ἄρτον ἐσθίων μήτε οἶνον πίνων.** The Baptist could not have been accused of gluttony if he ate bread. The original reading seems to me to be that of D and most of the Latin and other versions which omit ἄρτον and οἶνον, it being meant by ἐσθίων that John was not indulging in ordinary food but strictly limited himself to hard fare. Probably ἄρτον was intruded by one who wished to point out that the Baptist's food was ἀκρίδες καὶ μέλι ἄγριον, and not bread as is the food of other people; when ἄρτον was thus clapped on, οἶνον would naturally follow suit.

7-35. **ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς.** Read Σαμάρεια for σοφία. We have here a loose quotation in the form of a proverb from the savage stigmatization addressed to Jerusalem in Ezek.16-51 Σαμάρεια κατὰ τὰς ἡμίσεις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν σου οὐχ ἥμαρτε, καὶ ἐπλήθυνας τὰς ἀνομίας σου ὑπὲρ αὐτὰς (i.e. ὑπὲρ Σαμάρειαν and Σόδομα), καὶ ἐδικαίωσας τὰς ἀδελφάς σου (i.e. Σαμάρειαν and Σόδομα) ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἀνομίαις σου αἷς ἐποίησας. The meaning is that *Samaria* by comparison *has proved righteous in her* sinful *works*. 23-4 Σαμάρεια ἦν Ὁολὰ καὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἦν Ὁολιβά. As Samaria's sinful works, according to Ezekiel, have been thrown into the shade by those of Jerusalem, so the sin of your obstinate unbelief has thrown into the shade all previous known iniquities. In Ezekiel there are further comparisons of Jerusalem with Σόδομα and Συρία; the latter would be nearest palaeographically to σοφία, but on the whole I think Σαμάρεια is the most probable lection.

7-37. γυνὴ ἥτις ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἁμαρτωλός. I.e. *γυνὴ πολιτικὴ, a woman about the town, a public woman.* Sophocles records an instance of *πολιτικὴ* in this sense from Theophanes Continuatus 430, and I seem to remember that Dr. Milligan has quoted another instance in one of his writings, but I cannot now recall in which. Cf. also ClemA.Protr. 2-13 *πόρνην πολίτιδα.* Plut.Lucul.6 *Πραικία τις ἦν ὄνομα, τῶν ἐφ' ὥρᾳ καὶ λαμυρίᾳ διαβοήτων ἐν τῇ πόλει, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα κρείττων οὐδὲν ἀνέδην ἑταιρούσης γυναικός.* Xen.Mem.3-11-1 *γυναικὸς ἐν τῇ πόλει οἵας συνεῖναι τῷ πείθοντι* (=*any one who paid*, see my note on Acts 12-20). The word preserved in MGk in the form *δημόσια, a public woman*, exactly as in Heliod.3-3 *δημώδεις γυναῖκας.* Neither Grimm nor Zorell comment upon *ἐν τῇ πόλει.* As a matter of curiosity I may add that the Byzantine pedants attached the epithet *πολιτικὸς* to the modern verse of fifteen syllables as an opprobrious term, i.e. *prostitute.*

ἁμαρτωλός. Paspati (refer to my footnote on Jn 15–8) states 'to-day public women are called *ἁμαρτωλαὶ* among themselves, and *ἁμαρτάνω* is to follow the profession of a harlot.'

7-38. στᾶσα ὀπίσω παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ κλαίουσα, ἤρξατο βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ τοῖς δάκρυσι καὶ ταῖς θριξὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξέμαξε, καὶ κατεφίλει τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤλειφε τῷ μύρῳ. This passage cannot have been suggested either by the narrative in Mark (14–3) or by that in Matthew (26-7), for in those narratives no washing of feet is mentioned, and the complaint made against the woman is not that she was a sinner as in Luke, but on the score of so much costly perfumed oil being wasted; moreover, in Mark and Matthew the head of the Lord is anointed whereas in Luke the feet only are so treated. Luke's account must have come from some other work now lost, which being perhaps loosely phrased led him into a regrettable misconception, he in his turn dragging down everybody else who has since read this passage. Judging by the construction of *κατεφίλει τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤλειφε τῷ μύρῳ* we must conclude that Luke meant *τοὺς πόδας* to be an object not only of *κατεφίλει* but also of *ἤλειφε*, and so have all commentators, so far as I know, understood the syntax. But in the original work I surmise that *ἤλειφε* was unconnected with *τοὺς πόδας* or meant so to be. For, in the first place, how could the woman neglect to anoint the head, which was the obvious and most important thing to do, and only

anoint the feet? Secondly, washing of feet is frequently mentioned in Scripture (cf. Jn 13-5. Gen. 19-2. 18-4. 24-32. 43-23. Judg. 19-21. 1 Kings 25-41. 2 Kings 11-8. Cant. 5-3), but nowhere is it accompanied with their anointment. In the lost work the object of ἤλειφε must have been *τὴν κεφαλήν*, either explicitly expressed or to be supplied. The absurdity of the feet being anointed must have equally struck some transcriber or transcribers at v. 46 *ἐλαίῳ τὴν κεφαλήν μου οὐκ ἤλειψας, αὕτη δὲ μύρῳ ἤλειψέ μου τοὺς πόδας*, for D and several Latin and other witnesses omit *τοὺς πόδας* and only give *ἐλαίῳ τὴν κεφαλήν μου οὐκ ἤλειψας, αὕτη δὲ μύρῳ ἤλειψε*, i.e. *τὴν κεφαλήν*.

κατεφίλει τοὺς πόδας. Cf. Esth. [5] *φιλεῖν τὰ πέλματα ποδῶν αὐτοῦ*. An Oriental sign of humility, preserved in the kissing of the feet of high dignitaries of the Christian Churches. I have seen it done at Jerusalem and at Samos.

7-40. **εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν.** The variant *dixit ad Petrum*, or *dixit Simoni*, is well worth consideration.

7-45. **εἰσῆλθον.** Griesbach has given preference to the variant *εἰσῆλθεν*. Pernot, Études sur la langue des Évangiles, p. 201 'Les meilleurs manuscrits donnent *εἰσῆλθον*, que conservent les Éditeurs, mais la leçon *εἰσῆλθεν*, quoique beaucoup moins attestée, est la seule logique, car la femme n'est venue que lorsque Jésus prenait son repas. C'est probablement à la présence de *εἰσῆλθον* v. 44 qu'est due son intrusion au v. 45.'

8-4. **τῶν κατὰ πόλιν.** *The men belonging to a town*, the townsmen. Cf. Acts 21-21 *τοὺς κατὰ τὰ ἔθνη*. 24-14 *πιστεύων πᾶσι τοῖς κατὰ τὸν νόμον* = *believing all that exists*, or is recorded, *in the Law*. Similarly Acts 15-19 *τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν*.

8-14. **πορευόμενοι συνπνίγονται.** In my note on Jn 12-10 *ὑπῆγον καὶ ἐπίστευον* I have commented as follows: 'In MGk, when reference is made to a man's action with disapproval or astonishment, to the verb denoting that action the verb *πηγαίνει* (= *ὑπάγει, πορεύεται*) is often added without any notion of going,' and I have illustrated this peculiarity by abundant examples. We have a like case here; the versions therefore *which go forth and are choked* or *as they go on their way they are choked* are incorrect.

8-18. **βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκούετε.** *Take heed how ye are instructed.* Cf.

Hebr.2-1 *δεῖ περισσοτέρως προσέχειν ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσι.* Ap.3-3 *μνημόνευε οὖν πῶς εἴληφας = ἔμαθες, ἤκουσας* (cf. Arist.Eq.989 *τὴν Δωριστὶ μόνην ἂν ἁρμόττεσθαι τὴν λύραν, ἄλλην δ'οὐκ ἐθέλειν λαβεῖν.* Ran. 251 *τουτὶ παρ'ὑμῶν λαμβάνω*, i.e. *μανθάνω.* Plat.Theaet. 175e *ἁρμονίαν λόγων λαβόντος*, etc, all these examples quoted by Blaydes at Arist. Eq.991). For *ἀκούειν = to be instructed* cf. Jn 5-30 *καθὼς ἀκούω κρίνω.* 6-45 *ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μαθών.* 8-38 *ἃ ἠκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ποιεῖτε.* Mt 5-21 *ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις.* Xen.Mem.4-7-5 *οὐδὲ τούτων ἀνήκοος* (*= uninstructed*) *ἦν*; see my notes on Jn 5-30 and Rom.10-17.

8-23. **ἀφύπνωσεν.** So Philostr.Apoll.8-7 *ἀπεκάθευδον.* The preposition the same as in the MGk *ἀποκοιμήθηκε, he fell off to sleep.*

8-24. **διήγειραν αὐτὸν λέγοντες Ἐπιστάτα ἐπιστάτα, ἀπολλύμεθα. Ὁ δὲ διεγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησε τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ τῷ κλύδωνι τοῦ ὕδατος, καὶ ἐπαύσαντο καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς Ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν; Φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν λέγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους Τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν;** So far as I know no scholar has taken exception to *φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν*, but such a statement seems to me paradoxical; it states that as a consequence of their terror the disciples were astonished, whereas the only rational sequence would be the reverse, i.e. that having been first struck with amazement they were seized with terror. My opinion is that no derivative from *φόβος* figured in the original text, for there is none in the parallel passage of Mt 8-25, which is practically identical with that of Luke, running thus: *ἤγειραν αὐτὸν λέγοντες Κύριε, σῶσον, ἀπολλύμεθα. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Τί δειλοί ἐστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι; Τότε ἐγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησε τοῖς ἀνέμοις καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη. Οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἐθαύμασαν λέγοντες Ποταπός ἐστιν οὗτος;* I suggest *Ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἔβη; Πάντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν.* When describing anything wondrous Luke is particularly fond of adding that everybody was astonished, and it is unlikely that he failed to do so this time. Cf. 4-36 *ἐγένετο θάμβος ἐπὶ πάντας καὶ συνελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες.* 2-47 *ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες.* 2-18 *πάντες οἱ ἀκούσαντες ἐθαύμασαν.* 1-65 *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πάντας φόβος.* 5-9 *θάμβος περιέσχεν αὐτὸν καὶ πάντας.* 5-26 *ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαντας.* 7-16 *ἔλαβε δὲ φόβος ἅπαντας.* For *ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἔβη* cf. 2Act.Pil. 10-2 *ποῦ διέβησαν τὰ ἀγαθὰ ὅσα ἐποίησας*; Hom.Ⓞ 229 *πῇ ἔβαν εὐχωλαί*; B 339 *πῇ δὴ συνθεσίαι τε καὶ ὅρκια βήσεται ἡμιν*; Gal.4-15 *ποῦ οὖν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν*; 2Pet.3-4 *ποῦ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία*; Asch.Socr.Dial.3

(quoted by Bloomfield) *ποῦ τὰ πρόσθεν αὐχήματα*; Possibly on becoming faint in the prototype *ἔβη πάντες* was read as *φοβηθέντες* under the influence of Mk 4-40 *ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν*.

8-29. **πολλοῖς γὰρ χρόνοις συνηρπάκει αὐτόν.** *For it had seized him many years ago.* The sense of *χρόνος* = *year* is illustrated in Sophocles by many instances, to which those of this passage and 20-9, as well as of Oxyr.Pap.1424 and 1593, may be added. It is the specific term in MGk for *year*. The wish *ἐρρῶσθαί σε χρόνοις πολλοῖς* which occurs in the above Oxyr.Papyri corresponds exactly with the MGk greeting *ὑγεῖες καὶ χρόνια πολλά*, *good health and many years to you.* The English version *oftentimes* is of course erroneous, as has already been pointed out by Meyer, the error starting with the Vulgate; but Meyer's own rendering *during a long time* is no better. Both with the sense of *oftentimes* and of *during a long time* we should have had the present *συναρπάζει* and not the plusquamperfect. The Vulgate's imperfect *arripiebat* is an additional error.

9-3. **μηδὲν αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν, μήτε ῥάβδον.** Luke repeats here the mistake *μηδὲ ῥάβδον* which exists in Mt 10-10. At that place I have commented as follows 'The picture which these words bring up before the mind's eye is that of an Eastern fakir who travels barefoot and scantily clad, begging his way. But invariably such beggars carry a rude staff to lean upon. These sticks are not articles of luxury and involve no expense. Hence I think that instead of *μηδὲ ῥάβδον* the correct reading is *ἀλλ'ἢ ῥάβδον* (*ἀλλ'ἢ* = *εἰ μὴ*, cf. Dan. (LXX) 3-95 *μηδὲ προσκυνήσωσι θεῷ ἑτέρῳ ἀλλ'ἢ θεῷ*) in accordance with what is in Mk 6-8, namely, *εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον*. M and ΛΛ being interchangeable in old manuscripts, ΥΠΟΔΗΜΑΤΛΛΗΡΑΒΔΟΝ (that is, *ὑποδήματ'ἀλλ'ἢ*) was misread as ΥΠΟΔΗΜΑΤΑΜΗΡΑΒΔΟΝ under the influence of *μὴ πήραν*, and *μὴ* was afterwards changed into *μηδὲ* in accordance with the proximate *μηδέ*. Should my suggestion be correct, it would follow that the blunder occurred very early, as the injunction to the disciples to carry no staff is repeated in Lk 9-3 in a way which precludes the supposition of an error.' Cf. also Philos.9-4-20, where the Essenes, a species of fakirs, are described as travelling *μηδὲν φέροντες πλὴν ὅπλου* = *ῥάβδου*.

9-4. **εἰς ἣν ἂν οἰκίαν εἰσέλθητε, ἐκεῖ μένετε καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐξέρχεσθε.** The Vulgate renders *in quamcumque domum intraveritis, ibi manete et inde*

ne exeatis, a reading supported by one old Latin, one Greek minuscule, and the Aethiopian version, but ignored by Baljon and Souter. Soden, however, has done well to record it–though he does so half-heartedly–for it is the genuine reading, i.e. *μὴ ἐξέρχεσθε*. The Apostles are exhorted to stay in one house and not to wander from house to house like common beggars. See my note on 10-7. That a minuscule offers this lection is one out of many proofs that the minuscules are not to be despised as is the fashion. For the loss of the negative see my note on Jn 5-46 and more particularly my note on Rom.1-19.

9-13. **οὐκ εἰσιν ἡμῖν πλεῖον ἢ πέντε ἄρτοι καὶ δύο ἰχθύες, εἰ μήτι πορευθέντες ἡμεῖς ἀγοράσωμεν εἰς πάντα τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον βρώματα.** The text as it stands must imply that the disciples had the means of buying food for five thousand people, which of course is out of the question. Besides, there is an insuperable difficulty in the combination *εἰ μήτι*, for *μήτι* always introduces an interrogation and *εἰ* does not comport with such; you cannot say *if do you perhaps wish etc?* The manuscript U, however, does not read *εἰ* but *ἢ*, which yields an admirable sense, i.e. *or is thy wish* (spoken ironically) *perhaps that we should ourselves go and buy food for all this crowd?* That we have to do with an interrogation is proved by the parallel interrogation of Mk 6-37 *ἀπελθόντες ἀγοράσωμεν διακοσίων δηναρίων ἄρτους;*

9-26. **ὃς γὰρ ἂν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με.** An allusion probably to the sneering in vogue among the enemies of the followers of Christ of which many of them were shy and in consequence of which they hesitated to call themselves *Χριστιανοί*. This sneer or *ὄνειδος* is implied in Mt 5-11 *μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς*. Hebr.11-26 *μείζονα πλοῦτον ἡγησάμενος τῶν Αἰγύπτου θησαυρῶν τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. 1Pet.4-14 *εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, μακάριοι*. 16 *εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανός (τις πάσχει), μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω*. Tat.Graec.17 *καὶ ὑμεῖς δὲ γέλωτος ἦν μὴ ἀποπαύσησθε, τῶν αὐτῶν ὧν περ καὶ οἱ γόητες τιμωριῶν ἀπολαύσεσθε*. The last quotation shows that the sneer was intended to be such as to excite mirth. What was it that gave rise to the sneer? I believe it was the word *Χριστὸς*, which the enemies of Christians pretended to derive from *χρίω* in the offensive sense of *besmearing*. It is also in allusion to this that probably 2Cor.2-15 refers to *εὐωδία*, meaning that if, as we are sneered at, we emit an odour, that odour is a sweet one.

9-30. **οἵτινες ἦσαν.** *Id est.* Cf. 2-11 *σωτὴρ, ὅς ἐστι Χριστός.*

9-31. **ἔξοδον.** The going out of the corpse from the house, *funeral*, and by extension *death*, *exitus*. The word as *ξόδι* (= *ἐξόδιον*) still alive in demotic MGk in the sense of *funeral*.

9-33. **μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ λέγει.** This can only mean *not knowing what he says*, which obviously conveys an impossible sense; but by distorting the present tense of *λέγει* into an aorist and rendering *not knowing what he said* the translators have made things worse, creating an impression as if Peter had previously uttered some outrageous remark. What the situation calls for is clearly that St Peter was confused at the apparition and at a loss what to say. In accordance with this some few minuscules read *τί λέγῃ* as it stands in the parallel passage of Mk 9-6 *οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἀποκριθῇ* (cf. also v. 58 *οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ*. Mk 8-1 *μὴ ἐχόντων τί φάγωσι*. Xen.Mem.2-1-30 *διὰ τὸ μηδὲν ἔχειν ὅτι ποιῇς*. 1Evang.Thom.7 *τί εἴπω οὐκ οἶδα*), but as usual their reading has been neglected. The Vulgate correctly *nesciens quid diceret*.

9-39. **καὶ σπαράσσει αὐτόν.** In several documents this is preceded by *καὶ ῥήσσει*, which I believe to be right. It was probably omitted because *ῥήσσει* was thought to express the same as *σπαράσσει*; but it signifies *throws down* (see my following note), and this is what happens to the unfortunate epileptics.

9-42. **ἔρρηξεν αὐτόν.** *Threw him down.* So in the AV, but exaggerated by the Revisers into *dashed him down*. Sophocles under v. *ῥήγνυμι* (= *ῥήσσω*) quotes this very passage in the sense of *to throw down*. In MGk *ῥήσσω* in the form of *ῥήχνω* has displaced *ῥίπτω*. Coraes in Plut.Sull.37 says '*τὸ παρ'ἡμῖν ῥήχνω ἐστὶν αὐτὸ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ῥήσσω, ῥηγνύω ἢ ῥήγνυμι.*' We can watch the beginning of this evolution in Eur.Bacc. 633 *δώματ' ἔρρηξεν χαμᾶζε*.

9-51. **τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐστήριξε τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ.** Cf. Dan.9-3 *ἔδωκα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν τοῦ ἐκζητῆσαι.*

ἐστήριξε εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. Cf. Enoch 24-2 *ὄρη ἐπ'ἀνατολὰς ἐστηριγμένα.*

10-4. **μηδένα κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἀσπάσησθε.** An injunction not to imitate beggars, who in order to extort alms often stop passers-by with their whining salaams or salutations; see my notes on 9-4 and 10-7. The disciples are to go on their way scantily clad as fakirs or mendicants, but to avoid anything that would assimilate their manners to those

of importunate vagrants. Probably something of the same sort is enjoined in 4Kings 4-29 *ἐὰν εὕρῃς ἄνδρα οὐκ εὐλογήσεις αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐὰν εὐλογήσῃ σε ἀνὴρ οὐκ ἀποκριθήσῃ αὐτῷ*. Robinson, The Evangelists and the Mishna p. 216, referring to our passage, remarks 'In times of great anxiety and concern in the state mutual salutations were prohibited.' But there is no trace of anxiety and concern at this place.

10-7. **ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ οἰκίᾳ μένετε ἐσθίοντες καὶ πίνοντες τὰ παρ'αὐτῶν —ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ—μὴ μεταβαίνετε ἐξ οἰκίας εἰς οἰκίαν.** As pointed out in my note on 9-4, the Apostles are commanded not to comport themselves after the manner of undignified mendicants, who go a-begging from house to house. Such a nuisance must have been in the order of the day in those times. For, taking advantage of the proverbially blind enthusiasm of new converts, there must have issued forth a crowd of vagabonds who went about representing themselves as Apostles and men persecuted for their stubborn loyalty to their new faith; they would point to their poverty as if it were the result of their personal sacrifices, adding many other pitiful tales, and thus in the name of Christian fellowship eliciting contributions from the credulous. Similar tricks are not unknown in our own times. That the traffic in Christianity was not inconsiderable is shown by 2Cor. 2-17 *οὐ γάρ ἐσμεν ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ*.

10-8. **ἐσθίετε τὰ παρατιθέμενα ὑμῖν.** A further injunction bearing upon manners, which directs the Apostles not to behave like gluttons but just eat decently what is put before them. So Weiss 'hier lediglich in dem Sinne, dass sie nehmen sollen, was man ihnen bietet, ohne weiteres zu fordern.' The same admonition in Sir.34-16 *φάγε ὡς ἄνθρωπος τὰ παρακείμενά σοι, καὶ μὴ διαμασῶ μὴ μισηθῇς* (probably *μυσαχθῇς, lest thou excite disgust*); *παῦσαι πρῶτος χάριν παιδείας* (i.e. like a well disciplined man) *καὶ μὴ ἀπληστεύου*. Similarly in MGk *τρῶγε σὰν ἄνθρωπος*, which is a current expression and means *eat like a man* and not ravenously like a beast.

10-11. **τὸν κονιορτὸν ἀπομασσόμεθα.** Valckenaer remarks 'verbum *ἀπομάσσεσθαι* his in libris inusitatum, neque ab aliis, quod sciam, Judaeis graecientibus adhibitum,' and corrects *ἀποτιναξόμεθα* in accordance with 9-5 *τὸν κονιορτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν ἀποτινάξατε*. Mt 10-14. Mk 6-11.

10-22. **πάντα παρεδόθη μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς εἰμὴ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ πατὴρ εἰμὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.** All commentators translate *all things have been delivered to me*, but the following words *οὐδεὶς γινώσκει κτλ* demonstrate that *παρεδόθη μοι* denotes *have been taught, explained, to me.* In my note on Rom.6-17 I have commented as follows '*παρεδόθητε* = *ἐδιδάχθητε, you have been taught.* So Sophocles in v. *παραδίδωμι.* Cf. Just. 56c *ὡς ἐδιδάχθημεν ἀφθόνως παραδιδόντες.* Euseb. EH. 6-18 *γεωμετρίαν παραδιδούς.* In this sense Mt 11-27 (=Lk 10-22) *πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου* and Acts 4-33 *ἀπεδίδουν* (probably *παρεδίδουν*) *τὸ μυστήριον* (Mss *μαρτύριον*). Similarly the simple *διδόναι*, cf. Jn 17-8 *τὰ ῥήματα ἃ δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς.* 17-14 *ἐγὼ δέδωκα αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον σου.*'

10-29. **θέλων δικαιῶσαι ἑαυτόν.** The scribe, as shown by *ἀνέστη* and *ἐκπειράζων* of v. 25, approached Jesus with hostile and insidious intentions, and there is nothing in the text to show that he modified his attitude; on the contrary, by his further question *καὶ τίς ἐστίν μου πλησίον* he still endeavours to trip up the Lord. I do not therefore consider that *δικαιῶσαι* is right. The original reading, it seems to me, was *θέλων δοκιμάσαι ἔτι αὐτὸν, desiring to make a trial of him once more,* what is stated by *ἐκπειράζειν* in v.25 being here repeated by its synonym *δοκιμάζειν.* Compare similar attacks made by the scribes as related at 11-53 *ἤρξαντο οἱ γραμματεῖς ἀποστομίζειν αὐτὸν περὶ πλειόνων ἐνεδρεύοντες αὐτὸν* and at 20-20 *ἀπέστειλαν ἐγκαθέτους ὑποκρινομένους ἑαυτοὺς δικαίους εἶναι ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου.* The change was probably brought about by the influence of the rebuke addressed to the Pharisees in 16-15 *ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ δικαιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων.*

10-40. **ἡ δὲ Μάρθα περιεσπᾶτο περὶ πολλὴν διακονίαν.** Martha's *διακονία* changed character in the legend of later times and she became glorified as a saint specially interested in charity; cf. Acts Phil.94 *ἡ δὲ Μάρθα ἐστὶν ἡ διακονοῦσα τοῖς πλήθεσιν καὶ κοπιῶσα σφόδρα.* See my note on Jn 11-5.

10-41. **ὀλίγων δὲ ἔστι χρεία ἢ ἑνός.** A locus desperatus. Part of the corruption is *ἢ ἑνὸς*, which probably represents a marginal comment referring to *ὀλίγων* and meaning 'or write *ἑνός*.' A few documents omit *ἢ ἑνός.*

11-8. **εἰ καὶ οὐ δώσει ἀναστὰς διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοῦ φίλον, διά γε τὴν**

ἀναίδειαν αὐτοῦ ἐγερθεὶς δώσει αὐτῷ ὅσων χρῄζει. The words διά γε τὴν ἀναίδειαν αὐτοῦ have been translated *yet because of his importunity*, though admittedly ἀναίδειαν means *shamelessness*. It has been supposed that the neighbour who asks for the loan of the three loaves persists in his request, making himself importunate and objectionable, a makeshift view which I presume emanates from St Chrysostom, for Euthymius says 'ἀναίδειαν δὲ εἶπε τὴν ἐπιμονὴν τῆς αἰτήσεως.' By a novel method of translation it is this supposed importunity which our versions give and not what our text explicitly states. As a matter of fact there is nothing in the text which points to an importunity; on the contrary, the neighbour's request is made politely and only once. On the other hand, it is clear from the context that his friend returns no rude answer but hands the loaves; he does so, however, not simply because he is asked by a neighbour, that is not a sufficient inducement for him to overlook an inconvenience, but for a better reason, namely, because he sees him in a real fix and thinks it a duty to help him out of his difficulty. Therefore read διά γε τὴν ἔνδειαν αὐτοῦ, *yet because of his need*, which is in accordance with Deut.15-7 οὐ μὴ συσφίγξεις τὴν χεῖρά σου ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου τοῦ ἐπιδεομένου· ἀνοίγων ἀνοίξεις τὰς χεῖράς σου αὐτῷ καὶ δάνειον δανιεῖς αὐτῷ ὅσον ἐπιδέεται, καθότι ἐνδεεῖται. Cf. also Isa.25-4 ἐγένου τοῖς ἀθυμήσασι δι' ἔνδειαν σκέπη. Act.Thom.149 πληρωτὴς τῶν ἐμῶν ὑστερημάτων καὶ τροφεὺς τῆς ἐμῆς ἐνδείας. Just.292b τὰς προσφορὰς καὶ τὰς θυσίας δι' ἔνδειαν (*because he was in need?*) ὁ θεὸς ἐνετείλατο ποιεῖν; The same thought in Xen.Mem.2-7-1 τὰς ἀπορίας τῶν φίλων δι' ἔνδειαν ἐπαρκεῖν. The idea of importunity was probably suggested by 18-7 ὁ δὲ θεὸς οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν βοώντων αὐτῷ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός;

11-13. πνεῦμα ἅγιον. A variant δόμα ἀγαθὸν seems to me preferable, for a bestowal of the Holy Ghost is here incompatible with the context. Bentley 'illud πνεῦμα ἅγιον est ex interpretatione.'

11-19. λέγετε ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐκβάλλειν με τὰ δαιμόνια. Εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσι; Διὰ τοῦτο κριταὶ ὑμῶν αὐτοὶ ἔσονται. Εἰ δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. A passage too concisely worded, and its drift has become exceedingly obscure. I believe it to be this: You accuse me of having dealings with the devil on

the ground that I cast out devils, asserting that it is by the agency of Beelzeboul that such miracles are performed. But your own friends claim that they too cast out devils (since there are exorcists among you, see Acts 19-13), and by your reasoning they must have dealings with Beelzeboul. Such an imputation would be resented by them, who would treat you as liars. I thus land you in a dilemma; either you must admit that your friends are infamous, which you will not do, or that I cast out devils by the help of God. As you are driven to elect the latter alternative, you must also admit that the kingdom of God is upon you, in other words that I am the Messiah.

11-21. **ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἔστι τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ.** I. e. *τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ ἔστιν ἐν σωτηρίᾳ* or *σώζονται*; also in 19-42. For *εἰρήνη* = *salaam*, *σωτηρία* see my note on Apoc.7-10.

11-22. **ἐπὰν δὲ ἰσχυρότερος αὐτοῦ ἐπελθὼν νικήσῃ αὐτὸν, τὴν πανοπλίαν αὐτοῦ αἴρει ἐφ' ᾗ ἐπεποίθει καὶ τὰ σκῦλα αὐτοῦ διαδίδωσιν.** The clause *καὶ τὰ σκῦλα αὐτοῦ διαδίδωσιν* was no doubt taken from Isa.53-12 *τῶν ἰσχυρῶν μεριεῖ σκῦλα*. But *σκῦλα* here is not a well-chosen word, for it is not the vanquished who obtain spoils (*σκῦλα*), but the victors. It has been pedantically used because it stands in Isaiah. Matthew 12-29 fitly replaces *σκῦλα* by *σκεύη* which is not in Isaiah, and this shows that his verse was borrowed from Luke.

11-24. **ἀνύδρων.** I have explained in my note on Mt 12-43 that *ἀνύδρων* is an early misreading of *μυρίων*.

11-35. **σκόπει οὖν μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν. 36 Εἰ οὖν τὸ σῶμά σου ὅλον φωτεινὸν μὴ ἔχον τι μέρος σκοτεινὸν, ἔσται φωτεινὸν ὅλον ὡς ὅταν ὁ λύχνος τῇ ἀστραπῇ φωτίζῃ σε.** This extraordinary sentence has had its defenders; no wonder, for there is no textual monstrosity in the New Testament which has not been upheld by arguments more or less ingenious. I thought at one time that perhaps, in accordance with Euthymius *σκόπει οὖν μὴ ὁ νοῦς σκοτισθῇ* and Gal.6-1 *σκοπῶν σεαυτὸν μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρασθῇς*, the text originally read *σκόπει οὖν μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἔσται* (= *ᾖ*, *γένηται*, cf. Mk 14-2 *μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ μήποτε θόρυβος ἔσται*. Hebr.3-12 *βλέπετε μήποτε ἔσται ἔν τινι καρδία πονηρά*. Protev.Jac.9 *φοβήθητε μήπως ἔσται τοῦτο*), *ἵνα ᾖ τὸ σῶμά σου ὅλον φωτεινὸν, μὴ ἔχον τι μέρος σκοτεινὸν ὡς ὅταν ὁ λύχνος τῇ ἀστραπῇ φωτίζῃ σε*. Thus as a conclusion from what preceded we should have an advice to the listeners to heed

lest their doings degenerate into sins. But D and old Latins drop v.36, and I am now inclined to think that, so far at least as that verse is concerned, it was a clumsy marginal note which, being cacographically scribbled in the first instance, took different forms. For the Syr.Sinaiticus gives *Therefore also thy body, when there is in it no lamp that hath shone, is dark; thus while thy lamp is shining, it gives light to thee.* An old Latin says *si ergo corpus tuum, lucernam non habens lucidam, obscurum est, quanto magis, cum lucerna luceat, inluminat te.* Another Latin gives *si enim corpus quod in te est lucernam non habuerit lucentem, tibi tenebrosa est; quanto magis autem lucerna tua fulgens lucebit te.*

11-41. **τὰ ἐνόντα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην.** An admonition repeated in 12-33 **πωλήσατε τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῶν καὶ δότε ἐλεημοσύνην**; it is on the lines of Tob.4-8 **ὥς σοι ὑπάρχοι** (= **τὰ ἐνόντα**) **κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος ποίησον ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐλεημοσύνην.** The admonition comes in abruptly because there is a play upon the word **ἐνόντα**, which means both *contents* as well as *what you can.* As it were: We speak about the cleanliness of the **ἔσωθεν** (the **ἐνόντα**); yea, give **τὰ ἐνόντα** (what you can afford) in alms, and then everything will come right. I have indicated similar artifices in my notes on 12-22. Rom.6-3. 7-4 and more especially 10-8.

11-42. **ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἡδύοσμον καὶ τὸ πήγανον καὶ πᾶν λάχανον.** As the Jews did not tithe every herb but only such as are fragrant, **πᾶν λάχανον** is suspect. The parallel passage in Mt 23-23, from which Luke drew, mentions **τὸ ἄνηθον**, and this may have been the original reading, the more so as there exists documentary evidence, recorded by Soden, in its favour. What reason could Luke have had for replacing **τὸ ἄνηθον**, one of the most fragrant herbs, by every kind of herb? Or, was he perhaps ignorant of the Jewish (see my note on 2-11) custom and thought that it did not matter much if he deviated from Matthew's words?

11-44. **τὰ μνημεῖα τὰ ἄδηλα.** Graves without any signs indicating that they are such; probably graves of the very poor. Encycl. Bibl. v. Medicine p. 3007 'the disposal of the dead was extramural; ordinary earth burial with or without coffins was perhaps the commonest.'

11-47. **οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οἰκοδομεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τῶν προφητῶν, οἱ δὲ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς. Ἄρα μάρτυρές ἐστε καὶ συνευδοκεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν, ὅτι αὐτοὶ μὲν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς, ὑμεῖς δὲ οἰκοδομεῖτε.**

In its present form there is no possibility of eliciting a sane meaning out of the text, for is it not nonsensical to say that, inasmuch as they built the tombs of the prophets and thus honoured them, the lawyers evinced approval of the deeds of their ancestors who had murdered those honoured prophets? That is, however, exactly what the text tells us. But in D and several old Latins (disregarded by Baljon) there is a variant *μάρτυρές ἐστε μὴ συνευδοκεῖν*, which affords a perfectly appropriate sense. A lawyer urged a strict adherence to the burdensome traditions of the Jews, and Jesus answers: Ye inconsistent hypocrites! You build the tombs of the prophets whom your ancestors murdered; how can we then follow the example of your ancestors as you urge, when by your own action in honouring those prophets you repudiate the deeds of your ancestors and protest that we must dissociate ourselves from their principles? For *μάρτυρές ἐστε μὴ συνευδοκεῖν* = *μαρτύρεσθε μὴ συνευδοκεῖν*, *you protest that we must not concur in*, cf. Nehem.9-29 *ἐπεμαρτύρω αὐτοῖς ἐπιστρέψαι αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν νόμον σου*. 13-15 *ἐπεμαρτυράμην ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πράσεως αὐτῶν* (= *ἐπεμαρτυράμην μὴ πιπράσκειν*). Herod.5-92 *ἐπιμαρτυρόμεθα μὴ κατιστάναι*. 93 *ἐπεμαρτύροντο μὴ ποιέειν*. Thuc.6-29 *ἐπεμαρτύρετο μὴ ἀπόντος πέρι αὐτοῦ διαβολὰς ἀποδέχεσθαι*. Aesch. Eum. 646 *ὑμᾶς δ'ἀκούειν ταῦτ'ἐγὼ μαρτύρομαι*.

μάρτυρές ἐστε. Qu.*μαρτύρεσθε* or *ἐπιμαρτύρεσθε*.

11-53.**ἤρξαντο ἐνέχειν καὶ ἀποστομίζειν*** **αὐτὸν περὶ πλειόνων**. Respecting *ἐνέχειν* Meyer correctly remarks 'not *to be angry* as usually interpreted, which would require a qualifying addition such as *χόλον* (Herod.1-118. 6-119. 8-27).' But his own interpretation *they began terribly to give heed to him in a hostile sense* is quite as inadmissible, for the hostility of the scribes did not begin on this occasion but was of long date. Nor is the reference to Mk 6-19 *ἐνεῖχεν αὐτῷ* to the point; that means *ἐμνησικάκει αὐτῷ*, *bore him a grudge*, and such an interpretation is equally incompatible with *ἤρξαντο*. The context demands a notion of *pressing* (by arguments and contradictions), and the variant *συνέχειν*, which is recorded in several Mss, seems to me to meet the case. Cf. 8-45 *συνέχουσί σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσι*. 19-43 *οἱ ἐχθροί σου περικυκλώσουσί σε καὶ συνέξουσί σε πάντοθεν*. With this agrees also the Vulgate *graviter insistere*.

* Most Mss give *ἀποστοματίζειν*.

With regard to *ἀποστομίζειν* I do not know where the English translators have found that this verb means *to provoke him to speak of many things*. Sophocles renders *ἀποστομίζω* by *to put difficult questions to any one*, and refers to Evang.1Thom.6-3 *ἤρξατο ἀποστομίζειν τὸν διδάσκαλον, καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσεν αὐτῷ ἀποκριθῆναι*, and evidently this is the correct sense here. The word is still familiar in MGk, but its import has become more forcible. Cf. Vlákhos '*ἀποστομῶ, fermer la bouche à quelqu'un* [by arguing him into a corner], *réduire au silence, confondre.*' The Vulgate gives *os eius opprimere*, which looks as if it understood the word in the MGk sense, which is also that of Evang.1Thom.19-2 *ἐθαύμαζον πῶς παιδίον ὑπάρχων ἀποστομίζει τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους.*

12-3. **ὅσα ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἴπατε ἐν τῷ φωτὶ ἀκουσθήσεται.** The scope of this sentence is not different to that of the following *ὃ πρὸς τὸ οὖς ἐλαλήσατε ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις κηρυχθήσεται ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων*, except that it represents a man choosing not a private but a dark place in which to confide a secret. But why should darkness be necessary for such a purpose? What is essential is privacy (*ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις*); darkness is quite beside the point. I therefore read *ὅσα ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ ἐποιεῖτε ἐν τῷ φωτὶ ὀφθήσεται*, for it is strange that the case of a bad word should be mentioned but nothing said about that of a bad deed. The corruption was due to *ἐποιεῖτε* having been misread as *εἴπατε*, after which *ὀφθήσεται* would easily lapse into *ἀκουσθήσεται*. It follows then that Mt 10-27 *ὃ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἴπατε ἐν τῷ φωτὶ καὶ ὃ εἰς τὸ οὖς ἀκούετε κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων* is a later addition borrowed from Luke after the corruption of his text.

12-15. **ὅτι οὐκ ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν τινὶ ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ ἔστιν ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῦ.** I think that *ζωὴ* here stands for *βίος* = *πλοῦτος* (cf. 8-43, etc); in this signification it occurs twice in Herod.8-105.* If so, the sense is *for a man's wealth does not consist in the abundance of his* worldly *possessions*, this thought as a conclusion being again pressed in v. 21 *οὕτως ὁ θησαυρίζων ἑαυτῷ καὶ μὴ εἰς θεὸν πλουτῶν*. To express his idea St Luke seems to have used a very peculiar construction, which in ordinary style would have been *οὐδενὶ γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ ζωὴ ἐκ περισσῶν ὑπαρχόντων.*

* Cf. also Hom. *ξ* 96 *ἦ γάρ οἱ ζωὴ ἦν ἄσπετος.* 208 *ζωὴν ἐδάσαντο.* *π* 429 *κατὰ ζωὴν φαγέμεν μενοεικέα πολλήν.*

12-20. ὁ θεός. Qu. ὁ θάνατος.

12-22. μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ (= περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς, cf. v. 26 τί περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν μεριμνᾶτε;) τί φάγητε μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν τί ἐνδύσησθε. The antithesis both here and at the parallel passage of Mt 6-25 is between providing for the outside needs of one's body and satisfying the inside cravings of one's belly. Therefore the version of ψυχὴ by *life* is not correct; in fact, it creates a false antithesis between the body as a whole and life. There are many passages where ψυχὴ as a Hebraism signifies *belly*. Cf. Deut.12-23 οὐ βρωθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ μετὰ τῶν κρεῶν. 24-2 φαγῇ σταφυλὴν ὅσον ψυχήν σου ἐμπλησθῆναι. Job 38-39 ψυχὰς δρακόντων ἐμπλήσεις. Prov.19-15 ψυχὴ ἀεργοῦ πεινάσει. 25-25 ὕδωρ ψυχρὸν ψυχῇ διψώσῃ προσηνές. Sir.34-29 πικρία ψυχῆς οἶνος πινόμενος πολύς. Hos.9-4 οἱ ἄρτοι αὐτῶν ταῖς ψυχαῖς αὐτῶν οὐκ εἰσελεύσονται. The synonymity of ψυχὴ and κοιλία is shown likewise by Cant.5-4 ἡ κοιλία μου ἐθροήθη ἐπ᾽αὐτόν, where κοιλία = *heart, soul*. It was because of this synonymity being well felt that ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος came to mean a man addicted to gluttony or generally to materialism, as opposed to πνευματικὸς, the spiritual man. In MGk ψυχικὸ is the region of the belly.

In the words immediately following ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ πλεῖόν ἐστι τῆς τροφῆς I think ψυχὴ implies its specific signification of *soul*. For similar artifices see my note on 11-41.

12-29. μὴ ζητεῖτε τί φάγητε καὶ τί πίητε καὶ μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε. The Vulgate renders *nolite in sublime tolli*, in which it is followed by Luther; but as Grimm rightly remarks, such an interpretation 'parum quadrat ad antecedentia.' The true interpretation is *shun disorderly conduct*, for τί πίητε points to Luke having had in view riotous drunkards. Cf. v. 45 ἐὰν δὲ εἴπῃ ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος Χρονίζει ὁ κύριός μου ἔρχεσθαι, καὶ ἄρξηται τύπτειν τοὺς παῖδας καὶ τὰς παιδίσκας, ἐσθίειν τε καὶ πίνειν καὶ μεθύσκεσθαι. Such recommendations of a rather puritanical spirit we have also in Rom.13-13 εὐσχημόνως περιπατήσωμεν, μὴ κώμοις καὶ μέθαις. Eph.5-4 μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπελία. 1Cor.10-7 also repeats the contemptuous words of Ex.32-6 ἐκάθισεν ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν καὶ ἀνέστησαν παίζειν. Sophocles quotes three instances from the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries of μετεωρίζομαι in the sense of *to be frivolous* or *in high spirits, to amuse or enjoy oneself*, and four others from the third and fourth centuries of μετεωρισμὸς:

as equivalent to *levity, amusement, jesting*. ClemR.1Cor.30 had in his recollection Rom.13-13 μὴ κώμοις καὶ μέθαις in saying φεύγοντες μέθας καὶ νεωτερισμούς, where we must no doubt correct μετεωρισμούς. In Protev.Jac.6-2 for διεπλάνων αὐτὴν (= *amused her*) there is a variant ἐμετεώρισαν. Both the verb and the noun are still alive in MGk, though rather obsolescent. Vlákhos v. μετωρίζομαι '*badiner, plaisanter, jouer*,' and v. μέτωρον '*badinage, plaisanterie*.' Also μέτωρος is still alive in the sense of *buffoon, jester, scurra*, though overlooked by Vlákhos. Wagner, Carmina Graeca Medii Aevi, p. 144, quotes νὰ συντύχωσιν ὀλιγούτσικά τινα τῶν μετεωρισμάτων, *to say a few jocular things*.

12-36. **πότε ἀναλύσῃ ἐκ τῶν γάμων.** The English version, misled by the Vulgate *quando revertatur a nuptiis*, renders this by *when he will return from the marriage feast*. But ἀναλύω means *to depart*; Sophocles v. ἀναλύω besides other instances cites our passage in support. The original meaning is *to weigh anchor*; Liddell and Scott '*to loose from the moorings, to weigh anchor*, Lat. *solvere*; and so generally *to depart*, go away.' It is clear that if ἀναλύσῃ meant *he will return*, the following ἐλθόντος would be superfluous.

12-37. **μακάριοι οἱ δοῦλοι ἐκεῖνοι οὓς ὁ κύριος ἐλθὼν εὑρήσει γρηγοροῦντας· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι περιζώσεται καὶ ἀνακλινεῖ αὐτοὺς καὶ παρελθὼν διακονήσει αὐτοῖς. Κἂν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ κἂν ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ ἔλθῃ καὶ εὕρῃ οὕτω, μακάριοί εἰσιν ἐκεῖνοι.** It has been sought to account for the strange condescension of the master by theological arguments, seeing that on its own merits the idea of the master waiting upon his slaves is thoroughly preposterous, especially when applied to the East where the point of dignity is so strong; see my note on Rom.16-1. I cannot believe that the words ἀμὴν λέγω κτλ come from Luke, not only because they are so bizarre but also because they split the clauses μακάριοι οἱ δοῦλοι ἐκεῖνοι οὓς ὁ κύριος ἐλθὼν εὑρήσει γρηγοροῦντας and κἂν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ κἂν ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ ἔλθῃ καὶ εὕρῃ οὕτω, μακάριοί εἰσιν ἐκεῖνοι. To me the words in question seem to apply to guests who, unexpectedly perhaps, arrive at a hospitable house bringing glad tidings, and to have been intruded here from another work.

12-45. **ἐὰν δὲ εἴπῃ ὁ δοῦλος χρονίζει ὁ κύριός μου ἔρχεσθαι καὶ ἄρξηται ἐσθίειν τε καὶ πίνειν καὶ μεθύσκεσθαι.** The proper conduct of a servant during his master's absence is given in XII Patr.Jos.3-5, where Joseph

says that ἐὰν ἀπεδήμει ὁ κύριός μου, οἶνον οὐκ ἔπινον καὶ τριημερίζων ἐλάμβανόν μου τὴν τροφήν.

12-49. πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη; βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι, καὶ πῶς συνέχομαι ἕως ὅτου τελεσθῇ; It does not seem to me that any one has ever elicited any plausible meaning out of this passage. That it is corrupt the words *βάπτισμα ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι* ought to make plain, since Jesus' baptism had already been performed. I suggest *πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τί πενθῶ εἰ δεῖ ἀναφθῆναι; βασάνισμα ἔχω βασανισθῆναι, καὶ τί συνέχομαι μήπως τελεσθῇ*; *I have come to set fire upon the earth and why do I grieve if it is to be kindled? a torture I have to be tortured and why am I distressed if it should be fulfilled?* Jesus seems at first to fall into an agitated state at the impending strife and his own sufferings, but suddenly to rally and stifle his anguish, calling to mind that those misfortunes had been pre-ordained for a divine purpose and were part of his mission. To practically the same effect Jn 12-27 *νῦν ἡ ψυχή μου τετάρακται καὶ τί εἴπω; πάτερ, σῶσόν με ἐκ τῆς ὥρας ταύτης; Ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ὥραν ταύτην.* 18-11 *τὸ ποτήριον ὃ δέδωκέ μοι ὁ πατὴρ οὐ μὴ πίω αὐτό*;

δεῖ ἀναφθῆναι. Cf. Mt 24-6 *δεῖ γενέσθαι*, etc.

βασανισθῆναι. Corrupted also in 1Cor.15-29 *ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν; εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν*; (where read *βασανιζόμενοι* and *βασανίζονται*, that is, *why do people take so much trouble for their sake?* Cf. Gal.5-11 *εἰ περιτομὴν ἔτι κηρύσσω, τί ἔτι διώκομαι; if I am to preach circumcision still, why should I be willing still to undergo persecution?* HermP.9Sim.9 *εἰ οὖν φημὶ, κύριε, ἀνάγκη ἐστὶ, τί σεαυτὸν βασανίζεις; why does thou take so much trouble?* Pseudo-Ignat.Trall.10 *τίνος ἕνεκεν ἐγὼ δέδεμαι καὶ εὔχομαι θηριομαχῆσαι*; δωρεὰν οὖν ἀποθνήσκω). In Ignat.Eph.8 *βασανίζομαι* has been corrupted into *ἁγνίζομαι*. Reversely, in Lk 16-16 *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται* it is most probable that *βιάζεται* has supplanted *βαπτίζεται*.

ἔχω = *μέλλω*. Cf. Jannaris, App.IV, § 13, and my note on Rom.9-10.

μήπως τελεσθῇ. Against this conjecture of mine it must be admitted that it is difficult to account for the change of *μήπως* into *ἕως ὅτου* or into the variant *ἕως οὗ*.

12-57. τί δὲ καὶ ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν οὐ κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον; Read *ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν*, *in*

your own christian *courts*; cf. 1Cor.6-1 *κρίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδίκων καὶ οὐχὶ ἐπὶ τῶν δικαίων.* 6-5 *κρίνεται ἐπὶ ἀπίστων.* Acts 24-20 *τί εὗρον ἀδίκημα στάντος μου ἐπὶ τοῦ συνεδρίου*; 24-21 *ἐγὼ κρίνομαι ἐφ'ὑμῶν* (a wrong variant *ὑφ'ὑμῶν*, as in this passage).* This injunction in Luke is an anachronism, for the Lord addresses Jews and he is unlikely to have recommended them to avoid their own Jewish courts. It is an injunction suggested by what was happening in later times when Christians were urged not to appeal to non-christian courts but settle their differences among themselves. This feeling is referred to in 1Cor.6-1 *τολμᾷ τις ὑμῶν πρᾶγμα ἔχων πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον κρίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδίκων καὶ οὐχὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων*; 6-5 *οὐκ ἔνι ἐν ὑμῖν οὐδεὶς σοφὸς ὃς δυνήσεται διακρῖναι ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ ἀδελφὸς μετὰ ἀδελφοῦ κρίνεται καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ ἀπίστων*; That Luke had in view Jewish and not Roman courts is clear from v.59 *οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν ἕως οὗ καὶ τὸ ἔσχατον λεπτὸν ἀποδῷς*, which indicates a civil case; the Romans only interfered in criminal cases.

13-32. **ἰάσεις ἀποτελῶ σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι· πλὴν δεῖ με σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καὶ τῇ ἐχομένῃ πορεύεσθαι.** If the text is right, a comma should be marked after the second *αὔριον*, and *ἰάσεις ἀποτελεῖν* supplied. I.e. *I must* perform my cures *to-day and to-morrow and* then *proceed on the day following.* But more probably a word like *ἐργάζεσθαι* has been lost after *αὔριον.*

13-35. **ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν.** Many documents add *ἔρημος*, the addition being due to misunderstanding *ἀφίεται*, which was taken to mean *is left* whereas it means *ἐγκαταλείπεται, is being forsaken.* The translation of the Syr.Sinaiticus by *is forsaken* does not perhaps reproduce its text with complete exactitude. For *ἀφίεται* = *ἐγκαταλείπεται* cf. Mt 24-40 *εἷς παραλαμβάνεται καὶ εἷς ἀφίεται.* In MGk also *ἐγκαταλείπω* is expressed by *ἀφίνω* = *ἀφίημι.*

ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν. *Your nation*; cf. *οἶκος Ἰσραήλ.*

ὑμῖν. An ethic dative, *for you.*

14-7. **ἔλεγε δὲ πρὸς τοὺς κεκλημένους παραβολήν.** *And he told a parable aiming at guests.* According to the more usual expression it would be *εἰς τοὺς κεκλημένους.* Cf. Xen.Mem.3-14-4 *νομίσας ὁ νεανίσκος εἰς αὐτὸν εἰρῆσθαι τὰ λεχθέντα.*

* The same blunder in Thuc.1-97-1 *ἀπὸ κοινῶν ξυνόδων βουλευόντων*, where read *ἐπί.* Cf. 6-40-2 *ἐφ' ἑαυτῆς (ἡ πόλις) σκοπουῦσα.* Heliod. 2-17 *ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν ἂν σκοποῖμεν.*

14-8. ὅταν κληθῇς ὑπό τινος εἰς γάμους (*to a festivity*), μὴ κατακλιθῇς εἰς τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν, μήποτε ἐντιμότερός σου ᾖ κεκλημένος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ σὲ καὶ αὐτὸν καλέσας ἐρεῖ σοι Δὸς τούτῳ τόπον, καὶ τότε ἄρξῃ μετ' αἰσχύνης τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον κατέχειν. This is also enjoined in Prov.25-7 (quoted by previous commentators) *κρεῖσσον γάρ σοι τὸ ῥηθῆναι ἀνάβαινε πρός με ἢ ταπεινῶσαί σε ἐν προσώπῳ δυνάστου* (*in the presence of a superior person*). Cf. also Lucian.683 *ἥκεις ἐπὶ τὸ δεῖπνον οὐκέθ' ὁμοίως ἔντιμος οὐδὲ περίβλεπτος τοῖς παροῦσιν, ἀλλ' ἤν τις ἄλλος ἐπεισέλθῃ νεαλέστερος, εἰς τοὐπίσω σὺ, καὶ οὕτως εἰς τὴν ἀτιμοτάτην γωνίαν ἐξωσθεὶς κατάκεισαι.* What is portrayed in these passages actually takes place in India; at receptions an early guest may be shown to the best place, but if subsequently a more important person arrives, that early guest will be asked quite coolly by the host to yield his place to the new arrival.

14-14. μακάριος ἔσει ὅτι οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀνταποδοῦναί σοι. The conjunctive is declarative and not causal, and it should not be disjoined from *μακάριος ἔσει* by a punctuation as is usually done. The meaning is *thou shalt be fortunate* from the fact *that they are unable to make a return to thee.*

14-18. ἤρξαντο ἀπὸ μιᾶς πάντες παραιτεῖσθαι. I.e. *ἀπὸ μιᾶς φωνῆς*, as some commentators have already explained. Cf. Lucian, Nigr. 14 *ἀναβοῆσαι μιᾷ φωνῇ πάντας ὥσπερ ἐσκεμμένους.* Herod.5-93 *ἅπας τις αὐτῶν φωνὴν ῥήξας αἱρέετο τοῦ Κορινθίου τὴν γνώμην.* The phrase has come down to MGk as *μονομιᾶς* (probably through *μόνον οὐ μιᾶς*) and *διαμιᾶς*, meaning *at once.*

14-23. ἔξελθε εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ φραγμοὺς καὶ ἀνάγκασον εἰσελθεῖν. The English translators, misled by the Vulgate and the usual signification of *ἀναγκάζειν*, have rendered *ἀνάγκασον* by *compel* and *constrain.* But there is no trace of a necessity for compulsion either here or at Mk 6-45 and Mt 14-22, where this verb recurs. The meaning suitable at all these passages is that of *directing* or *requesting*; and this applies also to Oxyr.Pap.2083 *τὴν γυναῖκα ἠνάγκασεν νίψαι.* Such is occasionally the meaning of *ἀναγκάζειν* in post-classical Greek, as Professor Pernot has pointed out to me.

14-34. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τὸ ἅλας μωρανθῇ, ἐν τίνι ἀρτυθήσεται; οὔτε εἰς γῆν οὔτε εἰς κοπρίαν εὔθετον ἐστίν. The text is defective, for who has ever heard that salt was or is employed in Palestine for improving the soil?

The natural thing to have said first of all surely was that bad salt is no longer fit for food. This we obtain by correcting γῆν by ταγήν. Cf. Hesych. v. ταγὴ 'ἡ σύναξις τῶν πρὸς τροφὴν ἀναγκαίων.' Originally ταγὴ meant *ration*, but eventually its meaning evolved into *food* generally. At Oxyr.Pap.1139 the editors say 'the word is commonly used for *food*, e.g. Chron.Pasch.1386 ἡ ταγὴ αὐτοῦ παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως.' It is still a familiar term for *ration*, but the verb ταγίζω means not only *to ration* but principally *to feed*. Vlákhos v. ταγίζω 'nourrir, donner à manger, donner en ration.' Sophocles registers two examples of ταγίζω = *to feed* from the ninth and tenth centuries. At Mt 10-29 γῆν seems to have displaced πάγην. The change of ταγὴν into γῆν may have been caused by a reminiscence of 1Kings 2-8 ἀνιστᾷ ἀπὸ γῆς πένητα καὶ ἀπὸ κοπρίας ἐγείρει πτωχόν. As regards εἰς κοπρίαν I do not think that it has been added because κοπρία has anything to do with salt, but by way of emphasis as the very opposite of food.

15-10. γίνεται χαρὰ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων. The English version *there is joy in the presence of the angels*. But ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων is merely equivalent to τοῖς ἀγγέλοις; see my note on 1-6. Euthymius at v. 58 'ἐνώπιόν σου, τουτέστιν εἰς σέ.'

15-29. ἐμοὶ οὐδέποτε ἔδωκας ἔριφον. *Thou hast never given me* (even) *a kid*. Goats, not producing wool, which was the chief source of wealth in primitive times, were considered animals of comparatively low value. The good son complains that his father would not sacrifice for his sake a young one of his least valuable animals.

16-8. ἐπῄνεσεν ὁ κύριος τὸν οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας ὅτι φρονίμως ἐποίησεν. How could the master praise his steward who had robbed him? It was not the master, not ὁ κύριος, but the υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, the men of this wicked world, i.e. ὁ κόσμος, who praised the shrewdness of the dishonest steward. In aiming at worldly goods they understand how to acquire them by efficient though dishonest ways; but the men of light and faith, who aim at salvation, do not understand how to secure it. All this looks like a thrust at certain avaricious men who would not contribute towards the needs of their fellow Christians, and the thrust is continued in v.11. The same error in 1Cor.7-22 ὁ γὰρ ἐν κυρίῳ (read κόσμῳ) κληθεὶς δοῦλος ἀπελεύθερος κυρίου ἐστίν. At 1Cor.11-11 we have a reverse misreading in the variant κόσμῳ (see Tischendorf) for κυρίῳ.

τὸν οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας. *The steward of unrighteousness*, i.e. the steward of heathendom, *ἀδικίας* being practically the same as the following *τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*. In the same sense it recurs in 16-9 *μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας* and in 18-6 *κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας*. So also v. 11 *ἄδικος μαμωνᾶς*. For by extension of meaning *ἄδικος* = *heathen, idolatrous, gentile*; cf. 1Cor.6-1 *τολμᾷ τις ὑμῶν, πρᾶγμα ἔχων πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον, κρίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδίκων καὶ οὐχὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων*; Apparently a Hebraism; cf. 2Kings 7-10 *υἱὸς ἀδικίας* = *a heathen*. Esth.1-[5] *δικαίων ἔθνος* = *the Jewish nation*.*

εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἑαυτῶν εἰσι. *Are in their own times.* Strictly speaking, we should have *ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ τῇ ἑαυτῶν*, cf. Gen.6-9 *τέλειος ὢν ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ αὐτοῦ*, etc.; but in Hellenistic times *εἰς* with the accusative was often used in cases where classically the norm is *ἐν* with the dative, cf.1-20 *πληρωθήσονται εἰς τὸν καιρὸν αὐτῶν*, etc.; see Blass's Grammar § 39, 3 and 4.

16-9. ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας, ἵνα ὅταν ἐκλίπῃ δέξωνται ὑμᾶς εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς. The import is: Create for yourselves friends by charity and sacrifices out of your worldly (*τῆς ἀδικίας*) wealth, so that, when you lose it by your death, those friends by bearing witness to your goodness may procure you a better wealth, an eternal bliss in the heavenly abodes.

16-11. εἰ οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀδίκῳ μαμωνᾷ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἀληθινὸν τίς ὑμῖν πιστεύσει; If you have not proved yourselves good trustees in this life by making proper use of your insignificant worldly (*ἀδίκῳ*) wealth, who will entrust to you that wealth of holiness which is in heaven?

τὸ ἀληθινὸν = *τὸ δίκαιον, the holy*, in contrast to the preceding *τῷ ἀδίκῳ*. In my note on Rom.3-7 I have stated '*ἀλήθεια*. From the context it is clear that *ἀλήθεια* is here employed in the same sense as *δικαιοσύνην* in v. 5. Apparently a Hebraism; cf. Ps.24-10 *ἔλεος καὶ ἀλήθεια*. See my notes on 3-21. 14-7. 15-26. Also 2 Kings 2-6 *ποιῆσαι κύριος μεθ'ὑμῶν ἔλεος καὶ ἀλήθειαν*. Tob.13-6 *ποιῆσαι ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (τοῦ κυρίου) ἀλήθειαν*, etc.' See also my note on Jn 3-33.

16-12. εἰ ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ὑμέτερον τίς δώσει ὑμῖν; This verse is an interpolation, intruded by a commentator who misconceived the sense of the antecedent verse. He took *ἀδίκῳ* to mean

* Lightfoot at Gal.2-15 'the word *ἁμαρτωλοί* was almost a synonym for *ἔθνη* in the religious phraseology of the Jews.'

the treasure which does not belong to you, which you acquired by unjust means, and τὸ ἀληθινὸν to mean *the treasure which is your real* and rightful *property.* Were the verse genuine, we should have to conclude that Luke penned a meaningless sentence.

16-16. ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται. In justification of *βιάζεται* expositors (see Meyer) have referred to passages like Thuc. 1-63 *βιάσασθαι εἰς τὴν Ποτείδαιαν,* but there *βιάσασθαι* means to *force one's way into,* as Jowett accurately translates; this presupposes a strong resistance, and it is inadmissible that resistance was offered on the part of the kingdom of God to those who were eager to enter it; the will of God was that men should adopt Christianity and thus enter heaven. The Peshitto adds εἰσελθεῖν, its translator evidently having taken *βιάζεται* in the MGk sense of *making haste*; such a sense is intelligible, but the addition of εἰσελθεῖν would be indispensable. Here εἰς αὐτὴν *βιάζεται* can only mean *is forced into it.* But where do we find that men were forced to embrace Christianity? On the contrary, the complaint in the New Testament is that Christians were persecuted and forced to keep back from the Gospel; cf. 21-12 ἐπιβαλοῦσιν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν καὶ διώξουσι, παραδιδόντες εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ φυλακὰς, ἀπαγομένους ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἡγεμόνας ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός μου, etc. In my view *βιάζεται* is an error for *βαπτίζεται* (see my note on 12-49), the import being: The Law and the Prophets and their commandments, which you Pharisees advocate, were only valid until John; but since his advent it is the kingdom of God, i. e. Christ, which is preached and which all righteous men embrace, as shown by the fact that they hasten to be baptized in the name of Christ. Mt 11-12 ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ ἕως ἄρτι ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται καὶ βιασταὶ ἁρπάζουσιν αὐτὴν was borrowed from Luke after his text suffered mutilation.

16-25. ἀπέλαβες τὰ ἀγαθά σου ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου καὶ Λάζαρος ὁμοίως τὰ κακά· νῦν δὲ ὧδε παρακαλεῖται, σὺ δὲ ὀδυνᾶσαι. The antithesis to ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου requires ὧδε, but the antithesis to σὺ δὲ requires the variant ὅδε. The original reading must have been ὅδε ὧδε. So Chrysostom οὗτος ὧδε and Epiphanius ὧδε παρακαλεῖται ὁ αὐτὸς Λάζαρος. As at the time when this gospel was written ὧδε and ὅδε had a very similar, if not identical, sound, one of them would almost inevitably be disregarded.

17-5. **Πρόσθες ἡμῖν πίστιν. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ κύριος Εἰ ἔχετε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως, ἐλέγετε ἂν τῇ συκαμίνῳ ταύτῃ ἐκριζώθητι καὶ φυτεύθητι ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, καὶ ὑπήκουσεν ἂν ὑμῖν.** The Lord's answer is not relevant to the request of the disciples for a bestowal of faith; to be such it should have contained a hint as to whether or how it would or could be bestowed. Instead of which the Lord is made to go off the point and mention the mighty wonders which the Apostles would perform if they had faith. Therefore I think that *ἰσχὺν* was the original word and not *πίστιν*. By this reading the Apostles ask for power, and the Lord answers that what they need is faith; if they had faith, they would be invested with power.

17-6. **εἰ ἔχετε.** The variant *εἰ εἴχετε* is preferable.

17-10. **δοῦλοι ἀχρεῖοι ἐσμέν.** *We are* mere *slaves*, men *of no account*, to whom no thanks at all are due whatever trouble we may take in the service of our master. Luke seems to use *ἀχρεῖοι* as the reverse of *χρηστοί*.

18-6. **ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας.** *The judge of the unjust*, or idolatrous, *world*; see my note on 16-8.

18-19. **οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰμὴ εἷς, θεός.** In my note on Rom.5-7, I have suggested that this clause is probably an echoing of the Gnostic controversy respecting a *θεὸς δίκαιος* and a *θεὸς ἀγαθός*. If so, the addition *ὁ πατὴρ* after *θεὸς*, of which Marcion has been accused as being the author, most probably was originally part of the clause. That it is feebly attested would be no wonder; once it became controversial matter and was attributed to Marcion, it would of a certainty have been systematically erased from all books read in the churches; such was, for instance, the case with the story of the adulteress in Jn 7-53 (where see my note). With the exception of ℵ B, all Mss give *ὁ θεός*; but the article must have been added when *ὁ πατὴρ* was erased. Even the transcribers of ℵ B at first wrote *ὁ θεὸς*, which demonstrates the tendency at the time of all transcribers to add the article.

Luke's clause has been copied into Mt 19-17 *τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω ἵνα ἔχω ζωὴν αἰώνιον*; *Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ*; *εἷς ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαθός*, but it has been bungled in the copying.

19-12. **ἄνθρωπός τις εὐγενὴς ἐπορεύθη εἰς χώραν μακρὰν λαβεῖν ἑαυτῷ βασιλείαν.** The nobleman described is a private person, and it is

curious that such a person should be represented as going in search of a kingdom. But probably Luke had vaguely in his mind the history of Archelaus and Antipas, who at the beginning of the first century travelled to Rome to place before the Emperor their respective claims to the kingdom of Palestine.

19-13. καλέσας δὲ δέκα δούλους ἑαυτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δέκα μνᾶς. In the parallel passage of Mt 25ff, from which Luke drew, three slaves only come into the narrative, and that is the case also in Luke according to one of the readings of v. 20, which is adequately attested and gives ὁ ἕτερος, meaning of course *the remaining one*, i.e. the third one. I read therefore τρεῖς for δέκα. The lapse from Γ = *three* to I = *ten* was a very easy matter, for it is well known that confusions of this kind in numerals are a familiar feature of Mss. The alternative reading of v. 20 ἕτερος (without the article) would not invalidate δέκα, but one does not see why seven more slaves should be brought in as κωφὰ πρόσωπα.

19-16. προσειργάσατο. Blaydes at Arist.Eq.840 with his usual thoroughness has illustrated ἐργάζεσθαι as denoting *to acquire*.

19-21. αἴρεις ὃ οὐκ ἔθηκας. Plummer 'perhaps a current proverbial expression.' The proverb occurs in Philo (see Taylor, Pirqé Aboth, p. 143) ἃ μὴ κατέθηκεν μηδ' ἀναιρεῖσθαι. Add Aelian.VH.3-46 ὃ μὴ κατέθου μὴ λάμβανε. Meyer quotes Josep.Ap.2 ὃ μὴ κατέθηκέ τις οὐκ ἀναιρήσεται and Solon (in Diog.Laert.10-2-9) ἃ μὴ ἔθου μὴ ἀνέλῃ.

19-23. σὺν τόκῳ ἂν ἔπραξα αὐτό. *I should have collected it with interest.* The English versions, in rendering ἔπραξα by *required*, have unfortunately reproduced the Vulgate inaccuracy *exegissem*. Here ἔπραξα stands for εἰσέπραξα, as it often does classically (see Liddell and Scott). So 3-13 μηδὲν παρὰ τὸ διατεταγμένον ὑμῖν πράσσετε, where again the AV is inaccurate in rendering *exact*, and still more the RV with its *extort*.

19-25. καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ Κύριε, ἔχει δέκα μνᾶς. Bleek (see Plummer) rejects this verse in accordance with its omission in several Mss, including D and Syr.Sinaiticus. Whether interpolated or genuine, it is not in its original form. The answer to the master is that the first slave had already received his reward, and the reward was not the deposit of the μναῖ but towns. Therefore the reward mentioned in the answer ought to be in terms of towns. So instead of μνᾶς I read κώμας.

19-31. ἐάν τις ὑμᾶς ἐρωτᾷ Διατί λύετε, οὕτως ἐρεῖτε ὅτι κτλ. This punc-

tuation lends an emphasis to οὕτως for which there is no occasion. The punctuation should be διατί λύετε οὕτως; *why do you loose like that?* i. e. without a right, arbitrarily. So exactly it would be in MGk γιατί λύνετε ἔτσι (=οὕτως);

19-38. εἰρήνη ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις. The ἔναρθρα stand for simple datives, of which idiom I have treated in my note on 1-1, where I comment upon ἐν ἡμῖν. Respecting εἰρήνη I have explained in my note on Apoc.7-10 (see also my note on Lk 11-21) that it is a synonym of σωτηρία, reproducing the Oriental salutation *salaam*. So that ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη would mean *blessings to heaven* or *heaven be blessed*; it follows that δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις means *glory to the highest* or *the highest be glorified*. Cf. Rom.16-27 ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. 1 Tim. 1-17 θεῷ τιμὴ καὶ δόξα, etc. It is an αἶνος or thanksgiving, as in fact is evident from ἤρξαντο αἰνεῖν τὸν θεὸν of v. 37.

19-42. εἰ ἔγνως κτλ. The apodosis to this truncated sentence is something like εὖ ἄν σοι εἶχε, *it would have been well with thee*. Such truncated sentences with ἄν (= εἰ) are quite frequent in MGk. Vlákhos v. ἄν '[ἐπὶ εὐχῆς] ὦ καὶ ἂν ἤρχετο! *ah! s'il pouvait venir!*'

εἰ ἔγνως καὶ σύ. Meyer 'as my μαθηταί.' No comparison is intended. In MGk καὶ σὺ is often added in commiserations, as it were *thou unhappy city!* Plummer 'the καὶ σὺ [perhaps] implies no comparison.'

τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην. I. e. τὰ πρὸς σωτηρίαν. See my note on 11-21.

19-43. ὅτι ἥξουσιν κτλ. This depends from κλαίω, to be understood from ἔκλαυσεν of v. 41. Namely, I weep over thee, *for days shall come upon thee, etc.*

19-44. ἐπισκοπῆς. Euthymius 'ἐπιμελείας.' As a derivative of ἐπισκέπτομαι this noun means a visit for comforting or succouring those who are either sick or in mourning or in prison; here metaphorically employed as if Jerusalem, which was looked upon as a moral delinquent, were physically afflicted.

19-48. ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἅπας ἐξεκρέματο αὐτοῦ ἀκούων. Euthymius 'διδασκόμενος.' See my note on 8-18.

20-9. ἀπεδήμησεν χρόνους πολλούς. *Went abroad for many years.* The version of χρόνους πολλοὺς by *for a long time*, due to the Vulgate, is not correct; that would be expressed by the singular, as in Acts 14-3

ἱκανὸν χρόνον διέτριψαν, etc. As explained in my note on 8-29, χρόνος is often employed in the MGk sense of ἔτος.

20-16. καὶ δώσει τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἄλλοις. As it is not a question of the vineyard being made a gift of but farmed, the correct reading must be καὶ ἐκδώσει, i. e. κἀκδώσει, and not καὶ δώσει. It is so higher up in v. 9 ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα καὶ ἐξέδοτο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς. I have commented upon a similar fault in my note on Mk 12-9, comparing the parallel passages Mk 12-1 and Mt 21-33 καὶ ἐξέδοτο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς. So also Mt 21-41 τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἐκδώσεται ἄλλοις γεωργοῖς. It may be, however, that Luke copied faithfully Mk 12-9 after its corruption.

20-20. ἐγκαθέτους. The same as ἐνεδρεύοντας (ἕδρα of course being a derivative of ἕζομαι), *lying in wait*. Cf. Gen.49-17 ὄφις ἐφ'ὁδοῦ ἐγκαθήμενος ἐπὶ τρίβου, and metaphorically Jez. 35-5 ἐνεκάθισας τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ δόλῳ. By extension ἐγκάθετος occasionally is employed in the sense of *deceitful* (compare *insidiosus*), and generally of *rogue*, πανοῦργος, as it is likewise here : cf. v. 23 κατανοήσας δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν πανουργίαν. In the same way ἐνέδρα means not only *ambush* but also *treachery*; cf. Plat.Legg.908d δόλου καὶ ἐνέδρας πλήρης. In Thuc.1-56 τὴν ἔχθραν τῶν Κορινθίων I have corrected into τὴν ἐνέδραν τῶν Κορινθίων. The verb ἐνεδρεύω follows suit; cf. Dem.836 εἰ μὴ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐνεδρεύθημεν, *if we had not been deceived by time*, as Liddell and Scott interpret. ClemR. in Homilies is very fond of ἐνεδρεύω in this sense. In Narrat. Josep.2 the author most probably had our ἐγκαθέτους in view in saying ἰδόντες τὴν καθέδραν τῶν λοιμῶν; if so, the true reading there must be τὴν ἐγκαθέδραν τῶν λοιμῶν. The same notion in θήραν of Rom.11-9 and κατασκοπῆσαι of Gal.2-4. Cf. also Philostr.Apoll.7-26 τὸ ἔφεδρον. 7-27 ὑπὸ τοῦ Δομετιανοῦ καθειμένος (ἐγκαθειμένος?). In Oxyr. Pap.1114 πρὸς τὸ μηδεμίαν ἐνδέραν περὶ τὰς στρατιωτικὰς τροφὰς γενέσθαι Hunt of course is right in correcting ἐνέδραν and translating *fraud*.

20-26. οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἐπιλαβέσθαι τοῦ ῥήματος. The definite article must point to a distinct ῥῆμα. Which is it? As the text stands this ῥῆμα must be ἀπόδοτε τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ, which, however, does not tally; there is nothing in that answer which can be so twisted as to lend a handle for controversy. Luke no doubt wrote οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἐπιλαβέσθαι αὐτοῦ ῥῆμα (or ῥήματος), *they were not able to lay hold of him by a* single *word*. Cf. Mt 22-15 συμβούλιον

ἔλαβον ὅπως αὐτὸν παγιδεύσωσιν ἐν λόγῳ. In fact, at 20-20 ἀπέστειλαν ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγον (or λόγου) we have a repetition of this very expression. Cf. also Narrat.Josep.1-3 ψευδὲς ῥῆμα θέλων αὐτοῦ καταλαβέσθαι, which is a reproduction of our passage, except that it attributes to Judas what Luke relates of the ἐγκαθέτους.

20-37. ὅτι δὲ ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροὶ καὶ Μωσῆς ἐμήνυσεν ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου, ὡς λέγει Κύριον τὸν θεὸν Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸν Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸν Ἰακώβ· θεὸς δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων, πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν. The argument is that at a time when Abraham and Isaac and Jacob had passed away, God spoke to Moses and called himself a God of those Patriarchs; therefore they were then living. But the addition of δὲ to θεὸς οὐκ ἔστιν vitiates the argument and creates a vicious circle; it states that, since God is a God of living, Abraham is also living. The Syr. Sinaiticus, however, gives *and behold he is not a God of the dead*, and Curetonius similarly *et ecce deus, etc.*; moreover, several old Latins state *deus ergo mortuorum non est*, all these variations expressing logically this clause as a conclusion. This is in accordance with the parallel readings of Mt 22-32 and Mk 12-26, which omit δὲ, thus stating Nay, *God is not a God of the dead*, as Abraham's example proves; he is a God of the living, and Abraham as being alive will in due time rise, and along with him the other dead. I therefore think that the particle δὲ is spurious, which is further proved by its being omitted by D and Origen (see Tischendorf).

The following words πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν make things worse. If the proof of God being a God of the living is that all live by his help (see my note on Rom.14-4), why bring in at all Abraham's example as a proof? These words do not exist in the parallel passages of Matthew and Mark, and I have no doubt they are supposititious.

21-3. ἀληθῶς λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἡ χήρα ἡ πτωχὴ αὕτη πλεῖον πάντων ἔβαλεν, πάντες γὰρ οὗτοι ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος αὐτοῖς ἔβαλον εἰς τὰ δῶρα, αὕτη δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ὑστερήματος αὐτῆς. In a somewhat similar spirit Xen.Mem.1-3-3 θυσίας δὲ θύων (Σωκράτης) μικρὰς ἀπὸ μικρῶν οὐδὲν ἡγεῖτο μειοῦσθαι τῶν ἀπὸ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα θυόντων. Hesiod.Op.336 κὰδ δύναμιν δ' ἔρδειν ἱέρ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν.

21-24. Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἔσται πατουμένη ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν ἄχρι πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ ἐθνῶν. The import probably is that the old Jerusalem will be trodden

down by the heathen until the ruling period of the heathen is completed (cf. Acts 24-27 *διετίας πληρωθείσης*), and the new and holy Jerusalem, that described in Apoc. ch. 21, descends.

22-6. **παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν ἄτερ ὄχλου αὐτοῖς.** The interpretations *without a crowd* or *without a tumult* or *in the absence of the multitude* are not correct; the meaning is *without any trouble* or *inconvenience to them.* In this sense ὄχλος is recorded by Sophocles, for he says '*ὄχλησις — ὄχλος, vexation, annoyance, trouble.*' Cf. *ὀχληρὸς, ἐνοχλεῖν, ἀνενόχλητος,* and Acts Ioan.60 *ἡρέμα λαλοῦντες ἀδιόχλητοι αὐτῷ ἐγενόμεθα, by speaking softly we caused him no trouble,* we did not disturb his sleep. The misunderstanding of the sense reaches to a long time back, and to it is due the variant *παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς ἄτερ ὄχλου.*

22-16. **οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτό.** There is a variant *ἐξ αὐτοῦ* strongly attested, which the AV has followed, and it seems to me to be far preferable to *αὐτὸ,* for it is intelligible that *αὐτὸ* should be substituted in accordance with the foregoing *τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν,* whereas I do not see that any one would think of altering *αὐτὸ* into the less obvious construction of *ἐξ αὐτοῦ.* Cf. Jn 6-51 *ἐάν τις φάγῃ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου,* where Origen quotes *ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου* as *τοῦτον τὸν ἄρτον* (see Tischendorf). For the syntax cf. 1Cor.11-28 *ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ἐσθιέτω.* Numb.15-19 *ὅταν ἔσθητε ἀπὸ τῶν ἄρτων,* etc. Bloomfield interprets *ἐξ αὐτοῦ* by *henceforward,* which is strange on the part of such a superior scholar.

ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ. The subject is *τὸ πάσχα,* i.e. *ἕως ὅτου ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ πάσχα πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ,* when we shall be reunited. For *πληρωθῇ ὁ καιρὸς* cf. Jn 7-8 *ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς οὔπω πεπλήρωται.*

22-17. **δεξάμενος ποτήριον, εὐχαριστήσας εἶπε Λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς.** 18 **λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.** 19 **Καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.** 20 **Καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λέγων Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον.** That this passage has been transmitted in a most confused condition springs to the eye, but apart from its inherent improbability we have the fact that vv. 17 and 18 are omitted by several witnesses. In the parallel narratives of St Mark (14-23) and St Matthew (26-27) but one drink is brought in, and one alone was

necessary, since it fulfilled the purpose of paralleling the wine with the Lord's blood; the second drink in Luke is purposeless. Besides I think *διαμερίσατε* can only have been intended to apply to the bread. My opinion is that the original text ran as follows: *Καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς. Καὶ δεξάμενος τὸ ποτήριον* (so several Mss instead of *ποτήριον*) *εὐχαριστήσας εἶπε Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον· τοῦτο πίετε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάστασιν. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.*

The disturbance most probably proceeds from a marginal note which aimed at conforming the text to the home service on the Passover Eve. That service commences with a blessing of sanctification over the wine and drinking the wine, the cup afterwards in the course of the meal being passed round again.

22-18. *λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν*. I read *λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν* and place the whole of v.18 at the end of the narrative in accordance with Mark and Matthew.

22-19. *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*. Read *τοῦτο πίετε*. For similar corruptions see Jn 4-7 and 4-10, where for *πιεῖν* there are variants *ποιεῖν*, and XII Patr.Jud.14-7, where the reading is *πίνῃ, πίνει, πίῃ, πίει, ποιεῖ*. In 1Cor.11-25 *ποιεῖτε* is repeated, but that part of the Epistle is not genuine. Justin also gives *ποιεῖτε*, having taken it no doubt from Luke after the corruption. If *ποιεῖτε* were correct, it would have been placed at the end of the narrative. Should my conjecture be well-founded, as I think it is, all those casuistical controversies connected with the Eucharist have raged thanks to an erratum.

εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. I think *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάστασιν*.

22-31. *Σίμων, ἰδοὺ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐξῃτήσατο ὑμᾶς τοῦ σινιάσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον. Ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδεήθην περὶ σοῦ ἵνα μὴ ἐκλίπῃ ἡ πίστις σου, καὶ σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήριξον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου*. This cannot be a reflection upon the conduct of the disciples, for their conduct is commended in v. 28 by *ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε οἱ διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου*. It must be an utterance of distress at some unsatisfactory event which happened in St Luke's time. This event is, I believe, the desertion of the faith by numerous Christians either from dread of persecution or from disap-

pointment at seeing the faithful die contrary to the promise of immortality which they thought had been made to them. Such an apostasy is alluded to in Acts 20-29 *οἶδα ὅτι εἰσελεύσονται μετὰ τὴν ἄφιξίν μου λύκοι βαρεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου, καὶ ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἀναστήσονται ἄνδρες λαλοῦντες διεστραμμένα τοῦ ἀποσπᾶν τοὺς μαθητὰς ὀπίσω αὐτῶν.* Accordingly the scope of our passage must be: Simon, Satan will derange the minds (for *ἐξῃτήσατο* read *ἐκστήσει*) of the faithful and make a plaything of them; but thou shalt remain steadfast, and revisiting thy weak brethren shalt bring them back to the fold. Somewhat similar thoughts are Apoc.2-10 *ἰδοὺ μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος ἐξ ὑμῶν εἰς φυλακὴν ἵνα πειρασθῆτε καὶ ἔχητε θλίψιν ἡμερῶν δέκα· γίνου πιστὸς, καὶ δώσω σοι τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς.* XII Patr.Ben.3-3 *ἐὰν τὰ πνεύματα τοῦ Βελίαρ εἰς πᾶσαν πονηρίαν θλίψεως ἐκστήσωσιν ὑμᾶς* (cf. 2 Chron.15-6 *ὁ θεὸς ἐξέστησεν αὐτοὺς ἐν πάσῃ θλίψει*), *οὐ μὴ κυριεύσωσιν ὑμῶν.*

ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐξῃτήσατο ὑμᾶς. It is a strange conception that Satan should entreat God—for, whom else was he to entreat?—to deliver the disciples or the faithful to him as his prey. Expositors seek to justify the text by a reference to Job 1-11 *ἀπόστειλον τὴν χεῖρά σου καὶ ἅψαι πάντων ὧν ἔχει· ἢ μὴν εἰς πρόσωπόν σε εὐλογήσει* (read *ἀλογήσει* both here and at 2-5). *Τότε εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ διαβόλῳ Ἰδοὺ πάντα ὅσα ἔστιν αὐτῷ δίδωμι ἐν τῇ χειρί σου*; but the analogy is very remote, if indeed there is any. I emend *ἐξῃτήσατο* by *ἐκστήσει*; cf. 2Chron.15-6 *ὁ θεὸς ἐξέστησεν αὐτούς.* 3Mac.1-25 *ἐπειρῶντο τὸν ἀγέρωχον αὐτοῦ νοῦν ἐξιστάνειν τῆς ἐντεθυμημένης βουλῆς*, etc. In XII Patr.Ben.3 there exists the same misreading, for the text fluctuates between *ἐξστήσωσι* and *ἐξαιτήσωνται.*

ὑμᾶς. Apparently the whole Christian body meant.

22-32. **ἐπιστρέψας στήριξον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου.** This reminds of Paul's suggestion to Barnabas in Acts 15-36 *ἐπιστρέψαντες δὴ ἐπισκεψώμεθα τοὺς ἀδελφούς.* Peter here likewise is instructed to revisit the Christian brethren and reconfirm them in their weakening faith.

22-36. **ἀγορασάτω μάχαιραν.** I have repeatedly lingered over the purport of this sentence in combination with *ἰδοὺ μάχαιραι δύο* and *ἱκανόν ἐστι* of v. 38, but it is baffling. Not only is it incredible by itself that the Lord should have recommended his disciples to arm themselves,

but such a recommendation flatly contradicts v. 51, where he deprecates violence and forthwith proceeds to cure the wound which one of his disciples had inflicted. Such explanations as that he forewarns the Apostles of the dangers which would beset them henceforward in their mission are forced and ignore the immediate use of a weapon in v. 49.

22-45. **ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εὗρεν αὐτοὺς κοιμωμένους ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης.** Grief does not induce sleep (as we all have experienced) but keeps awake, whatever imaginative critics may say to the contrary. Cf.Eccles. 2-23 *περισπασμὸς αὐτοῦ καί γε ἐν νυκτὶ οὐ κοιμᾶται ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ.* 8-16 *ἰδεῖν τὸν περισπασμὸν τὸν πεποιημένον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἐν νυκτὶ ὕπνον ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστι βλέπων.* Sir.34-1 *ἡ μέριμνα αὐτοῦ ἀφιστᾷ ὕπνον.* Jer.51-33 *ἐκοιμήθην ἐν στεναγμοῖς, ἀνάπαυσιν οὐχ εὗρον.* Dan.2-1 *ἐξέστη τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ ὕπνος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο ἀπ'αὐτοῦ.* 6-18 (the King being agitated) *ἐκοιμήθη ἄδειπνος καὶ ὁ ὕπνος ἀπέστη ἀπ'αὐτοῦ.* 1Mac.6-10 *ἀφίσταται ὁ ὕπνος ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν μου καὶ συμπέπτωκα τῇ καρδίᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς μερίμνης.* XII Patr.Jud.18 *συνέχει αὐτὸν ἐν πόνοις καὶ μόχθοις, τὸν ὕπνον ἐκδιώκει ἀπ'αὐτοῦ.* Sim.4 *ἐν ταραχῇ διϋπνίζει τὸν νοῦν.* Hom. Ω 4 *οὐδέ μιν ὕπνος ᾕρει πανδαμάτωρ.* Shaks.RJ.2-3 *where care lodges sleep will never lie.* Heliodorus in Aeth.2-15 states the contrary, i.e. *πρὸς ἡδὺ κῶμα διὰ τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τῆς λύπης ὠλίσθησαν,* but being a pedant mindful only of sound he talks at random. Read *κοιμωμένους ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.* Cf. Acts Andr.Mat.17 *περιβλεψάμενος εἶδεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καθεύδοντας ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν,* which looks like an imitation of our passage.

22-47. **προήρχετο αὐτούς.** Cf.Mk 6-33 *προῆλθεν αὐτούς.* At Rom.12-10 in commenting upon *ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι* I pointed out that this construction with the accusative instead of with the genitive is a Latinism reproducing *antecedentes,* and have quoted as other instances this passage and Phil.2-3 *ἀλλήλους ἡγούμενοι.* 1Thes.5-13 *ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτούς.* Pseudo-Ignat.Tars. 9 *τοὺς γονεῖς προηγεῖσθε.* Souter adopts the variant *αὐτῶν,* though feebly attested, and suppresses *αὐτοὺς,* probably by an oversight.

22-51. **ἐᾶτε ἕως τούτου.** A comma should be marked after *ἐᾶτε.* It is the current MGk phrase *ἀφίστε* (or *ἀφίστε τώρα,* cf. Mt 3-15 *ἄφες ἄρτι*), *ὡς αὐτοῦ* (or *ὡς αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ παρέκει*), *leave off, go no further.*

22-56. **καθήμενον πρὸς τὸ φῶς.** The AV correctly *as he sat by the fire.*

The RV *as he sat by the light of the fire* seems a compromise between the opposing views of the Revisers, some of whom probably contended for the AV interpretation, whilst others preferred the Vulgate *sedentem ad lumen*. But φῶς here as well as at Mk 14-54 means *fire*. Bloomfield calls this signification a Hebraism, but the MGk φωτιά, a specific term for *fire*, proves that it was genuinely Greek.

22-63. οἱ συνέχοντες αὐτὸν ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ δέροντες, καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες προφήτευσον. The parallel passage in Mk 14-65 states ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ προφήτευσον. From which I conclude that Luke did not write ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ but ἐνέπτυον αὐτῷ.

22-68. ἐὰν ὑμῖν εἴπω, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε· ἐὰν δὲ ἐρωτήσω, οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῆτε. As the text stands it indicates that Jesus might have been allowed to argue with, and silence, the chief priests, which is out of the question. For much less was he subjected to the indignity of being beaten as related by Jn 18-22. Michelsen corrects ἐὰν δὲ ἐρωτήσητε, οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῶ, which I believe to be right, and I had conjectured the same myself. Luke oratorically develops Mk 14-61 ὁ δὲ ἐσιώπα καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν.

23-5. καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας. See my note on Acts 10-37.

23-28. θυγατέρες Ἰερουσαλὴμ, ἐφ' ἑαυτὰς κλαίετε καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν, ὅτι ἰδοὺ ἔρχονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς ἐροῦσι μακάριαι αἱ στεῖραι καὶ αἱ κοιλίαι αἳ οὐκ ἐγέννησαν καὶ μαστοὶ οἳ οὐκ ἔθρεψαν. The Lord of course alludes to the ἐρήμωσις which was then threatening the Jewish nation at the hands of the Romans. So that the following proverb εἰ ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται means that, if in times of peace, such as is enjoyed to-day, such enormities are perpetrated, what will happen when the impending ἐρήμωσις comes upon you?

23-40. οὐδὲ φοβῇ σὺ τὸν θεὸν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι εἶ; I do not see the force of οὐδέ. Several documents record οὐδὲν, and that is the proper lection, being an equivalent of a simple οὐ. Our passage is reproduced in Acts Pil.10-2, and there also the reading fluctuates between οὐδὲν and οὐδέ. Jannaris §§ 1798 and 1799 'We very often find οὐδὲν as mere equivalent of οὐ. Οὐδὲν was reduced by aphaeresis to δὲν, a form ever since universally current in MGk.' This evolution of οὐ into οὐδὲν and μὴ into μηδὲν I have traced to classical times; cf. Plat.Soph.254c λόγου

ἐνδεεῖς μηδὲν γιγνώμεθα. Herod.5-34 οὐδὲν πάντως προσεδέκοντο ἐπὶ σφέας τὸν στόλον τοῦτον ὁρμήσεσθαι. Xen.Mem.2-1-30 διὰ τὸ μηδὲν ἔχειν ὅ τι ποιῇς. Eur.Bacc.209 δι' ἀριθμῶν οὐδὲν (=οὐκ) αὔξεσθαι θέλει. See my note on Jn 20-9.

ὅτι = ὅς. In many places, and chiefly in my note on Rom.8-29, I have shown that often ὅτι represents an indeclinable conjunction which replaces relative pronouns in all their forms.

24-21. **ἠλπίζομεν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ· ἀλλά γε καὶ σὺν πᾶσι τούτοις τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει ἀφ' οὗ ταῦτα ἐγένετο. Ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκές τινες ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξέστησαν ἡμᾶς.** There has crept a disturbance into this passage. After recounting the occurrences connected with Jesus' trial and execution the natural way for the disciples to proceed was to mention the time when those things happened, and then as a climax to their bewilderment to add the extraordinary report of the women. I think therefore that the original text was *ἠλπίζομεν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ. Τρίτην δὲ ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει ἀφ' οὗ ταῦτα ἐγένετο. Ἀλλά γε καὶ σὺν πᾶσι τούτοις καὶ γυναῖκές τινες ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξέστησαν ἡμᾶς.* Where *σὺν πᾶσι τούτοις* is placed in the text the emphasis and culmination fall upon *τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν* as if that lapse of time were the most extraordinary thing of all that happened. In 16-26 *ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις* likewise introduces a culmination.

24-32. **οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καιομένη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν, ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ὡς διήνοιγεν ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς;** It does not seem to me that *καιομένη* fits the context; its meaning would be *ardent, passionate,* or *distressed.* Sophocles v. *καίω* quotes from Nicol.Damasc. (beginning of Christian era) 30 *καιόμενος τῷ πόθῳ αὐτῆς.* Add Hom. *a*48 *ἀλλά μοι ἀμφ'Ὀδησῆϊ* (read *Ὀδυσέϊ*) *δαΐφρονι δαίεται ἦτορ.* Deut.19-6 *διώξας ὁ ἀγχιστεύων, ὅτι παρατεθέρμανται τῇ καρδίᾳ.* 4Kings 22-13 *ὀργὴ κυρίου ἐκκεκαυμένη.* Ps. 88-47 *ἐκκαυθήσεται ἡ ὀργή σου.* 2Mac.10-35 *πυρωθέντες τοῖς θυμοῖς.* 3 Mac.4-2 *στεναγμοῖς πεπυρωμένης τῆς καρδίας.* Plut.Mar.16 *θυμὸς αὐτῆς παριστάμενος ἐξεθέρμαινε καὶ διέφλεγε τὰς ψυχάς.* Herod.5-19 *σχεδόν σευ ἀνακαιομένου συνίημι τοὺς λόγους ὅτι ἐθέλεις ποιέειν τι νεώτερον.* XII Patr. Neph.7 *ἐκαιόμην τοῖς σπλάγχνοις μου ἀναγγεῖλαι, my heart was all aglow* with the desire *to announce.* D gives *κεκαλυμμένη,* which was probably taken from 2Cor.3-14 *ἐπωρώθη τὰ νοήματα αὐτῶν, ἄχρι γὰρ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης μένει.* In

the old Latin versions we find a rendering *excaecatum*, which, as already remarked by critics, leads to πεπηρωμένη, *blinded*. This once must have been written πεπυρωμένη, *burning*, for which its synonym καιομένη was substituted. As any one can see for himself at a glance, such substitutes are a very frequent feature of the New Testament; I quote as instances Mt 5-47 ἀδελφοὺς–φίλους. 47 ἐθνικοὶ–τελῶναι. 7-4 ἐκ–ἀπό. 34 ὅπως–ἵνα. 9-14 πολλὰ–πυκνά. 36 ἐσκυλμένοι–ἐκλελυμένοι. 15-6 λόγον –νόμον–ἐντολήν. 20-34 ὀμμάτων–ὀφθαλμῶν. Mk 1-26 φωνῆσαν–κράξαν. 3-30 ἁμαρτίας–κρίσεως. 4-19 αἰῶνος–βίου. 14-44 σύσσημον–σημεῖον, etc. But I think that πεπηρωμένη itself was a misreading of πεπωρωμένη, for in v. 45 it is said διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφὰς, and συνιέναι is often encountered in the same sentence with πωροῦσθαι as its antithesis. Cf. Mk 6-52 οὐ γὰρ συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις, ἀλλ'ἦν ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν πεπωρωμένη. 8-17 οὔπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίετε; πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; Jn 12-40 ἐπώρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, ἵνα μὴ νοήσωσι τῇ καρδίᾳ. So here πεπωρωμένη of v. 32 would form the antithesis to συνιέναι of v. 45. Another variant in our passage is *gravatum*, βεβαρημένη, which equally leads to πεπωρωμένη. Cf. Exod.7-14 βεβάρηται ἡ καρδία Φαραὼ=πεπώρωται, both the verbs βαρεῖσθαι and πωροῦσθαι signifying *to be hardened*. The same reading is also represented by the other Latin translation *obtusum*.

ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ὡς διήνοιγεν ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς. For the repetition of ὡς cf. 4-25 πολλαὶ χῆραι ἦσαν, ὅτε ἐκλείσθη ὁ οὐρανὸς, ὡς ἐγένετο λιμός. Herod.8-56 ὥς σφι ἐξηγγέλθη ὡς ἔσχε.

24-41. ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς. The text cannot be right, for surely one rejoices if one believes in the reality of a joyful event, not if one disbelieves it. I read ἀποσιγώντων, which palaeographically is pretty close to ἀπιστούντων. Thus we see the disciples struck with aphasia from their overwhelming joy at the sudden reappearance of their beloved master. Cf. ClemR.Hom.14-9 ἀφασίᾳ συσχεθέντες ἐκ τῆς ἁπλήστου χαρᾶς. Of ἀποσιγῶ =*to be silent* Sophocles cites one example from the Constitutiones Apostolorum.

THE ACTS

1-1. περὶ πάντων ὧν (= ἃ) ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας ἀνελήμφθη. Peculiarly expressed for *περὶ πάντων ὧν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐποίησέ τε καὶ ἐδίδαξε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἄχρι ἀναλήμψεως, concerning everything from beginning to end which Jesus did either in acts or in teaching.* Cf. v. 21 *ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ ᾧ εἰσῆλθε καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος Ἰωάννου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς ἀνελήμφθη.*

1-2. ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου οὓς ἐξελέξατο. The words *διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου* are generally connected with *ἐντειλάμενος*; but the commandment to the Apostles as related at the end of Luke's gospel was direct and not *through the Holy Ghost.* Our Evangelist means that the selection of the Apostles, that narrow circle of the twelve, was the result of guidance from above, and so is the matter understood in Peter's Predication referred to by Clement of Alexandria Strom.6-6-48 *ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς δώδεκα μαθητὰς κρίνας ἀξίους ἐμοῦ, οὓς ὁ κύριος ἠθέλησεν.* An invocation for a similar guidance we have further on in v. 24 *σὺ, κύριε, καρδιογνῶστα πάντων, ἀνάδειξον ὃν ἐξελέξω.* Nor is there anything ungrammatical or anomalous in connecting *διὰ πνεύματος* with *ἐξελέξατο.* Cf. 5-35 *προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις τί μέλλετε πράσσειν = πράσσειν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.* 20-18 *ἐπίστασθε ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας πῶς μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐγενόμην = ἐγενόμην ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας.*

1-6. ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες Κύριε, εἰ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἀποκαθιστάνεις τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ Ἰσραήλ; Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς Οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστι γνῶναι χρόνους ἢ καιροὺς, οὓς ὁ πατὴρ ἔθετο ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ. The answer put in the mouth of the Lord was no doubt meant to explain away the awkward point of no *παλιγγένεσις* forthcoming, such as the converts were promised and ardently were longing for. In my note on Jn 14-2 I have said 'At that time the adherents to Christianity, who had expected an advent of the kingdom of God in their lifetime, were bitterly disappointed to see the deaths of the faithful.'

1-15. ἀναστὰς Πέτρος ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν εἶπεν (ἦν τε ὄχλος ὀνομάτων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὡς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσιν) Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί. The parenthesis requires ἦν δὲ as de Bèze conjectured.

ὀνομάτων. Preserved in MGk in the form *ἀνομᾶτος* = *person*, individual. In 1Kings 4-10 for *τριάκοντα χιλιάδες ταγμάτων* read *ὀνομάτων*. Philostr.Apoll.Epist.66 *λῷον ὄνομα* = *a better person*, as Conybeare correctly suggests.

1-16. προεῖπε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διὰ στόματος Δαβὶδ περὶ Ἰούδα τοῦ γενομένου ὁδηγοῦ τοῖς συλλαβοῦσι τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὅτι κατηριθμημένος ἦν ἐν ὑμῖν. Here *ὅτι* = *ὅς*, being the indeclinable conjunction which replaces relative pronouns in all their forms; see my note on Rom.8-29 and Jn 1-16. The translator of the Vulgate saw the relative force of *ὅτι*, for it renders *qui connumeratus erat*. Neither as causal nor as declarative dependent from *προεῖπε* does it suit the context.

1-18. πρηνὴς γενόμενος ἐλάκησε. The expression *πρηνὴς γενόμενος* for *πρηνὴς πεσὼν* is unparalleled. Read *περιτενὴς γενόμενος*, *becoming distended, swollen*, to which both Papias's (see Tischendorf) ὁ Ἰούδας *πρησθεὶς* and the variant *πρινὴς* in ℵAC, as well as in other Mss, point. We have confirmatory evidence in Acts Thom.33 ὁ δὲ δράκων *φυσηθεὶς ἐλάκησεν*, which I consider is an imitation of our passage, and in the Vulgate *suspensus*, an error no doubt for *distensus*. The word occurs in Hippocrates as a medical term, and to Luke, if he was a physician, it must have been familiar. Cf. also my note on 28-6, where I emend *πίμπρασθαι καὶ καταπίπτειν*.

ἐλάκησε. Its synonym *ἐψόφησε* is a specific term in MGk for *it died* when referring to the death of an animal; if applied to a human being, it implies scorn or hatred on the part of the speaker, similarly to the French *crever*. Such must have been the feeling which inspired *ἐλάκησε*.

2-1. ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πεντηκοστῆς. A variant *τὰς ἡμέρας*, preserved in versions, is preferable. Cf. 20-6 *μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν ἀζύμων*. Lk 2-6 *ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν*. 1-23 *ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς λειτουργίας*. 2-22 *ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ*. 9-51 *ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήμψεως*.

2-3. ὤφθησαν γλῶσσαι ὡσεὶ πυρὸς καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐφ' ἕνα ἕκαστον. The variant *ἐκάθισαν* is the only possible lection grammatically; but *ἐκάθισεν*, having secured precedence through the early editions of the

New Testament, continues, and will probably continue, to sway the judgement of editors.

2-5. ἦσαν δὲ ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ κατοικοῦντες Ἰουδαῖοι ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους. Blass 'Pessime interpolatum in plerisque (praeter ℵ) Ἰουδαῖοι, cum de gentilibus manifesto agatur.' I have surmised this interpolation myself.

2-9. Ἰουδαίαν. Hemsterhuis very plausibly Βιθυνίαν.

2-25. ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἐστίν. Drusius (see van Manen, Conjecturaal-Kritiek) ἔστη according to Theophylactus's τὸ δὲ ἐκ δεξιῶν ἑστάναι τὸν πατέρα λέγεσθαι νῦν.

2-26. ἐπ'ἐλπίδι = ἐν πεποιθήσει. Cf. 1ClemR.45-8. 57-7 κατασκηνώσει ἐπ'ἐλπίδι καὶ ἡσυχάσει ἀφόβως. Judg.18-7. 18-10. XII Patr.Ben. 10-11. Oxyr.Pap.1597, where Grenfell ἐν ἐλπίδι. I have quoted these instances in my note on Rom.4–18.

2-45. διεμέριζον αὐτὰ πᾶσι καθότι ἄν τις χρείαν εἶχε. Venema correctly καθ'ὅ τι.

2-46. προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ κλῶντές τε κατ'οἶκον ἄρτον μετελάμβανον τροφῆς. This reads as if the faithful continued steadfastly in the temple and partook of nourishment both there and at home. Read προσεκαρτέρουν πάντες ὁμοθυμαδόν. Cf. 2-1 ἦσαν ἅπαντες ὁμοθυμαδόν. 5-12 ἦσαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἅπαντες ἐν τῇ στοᾷ. The meaning is that they all clung in a body to the temple and in a body broke bread at home and partook of nourishment.

3-6. ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. As I have explained in my note on Rom.6-3, the invocation primitively was in the name of Jesus alone, so that the addition of Χριστοῦ here and at 4-10. 16-8. 1Cor.6-11. Gal.3-27 is highly suspicious.

3-8. ἐξαλλόμενος. Read with Blass ἐξαλάμενος.

ἐξαλλόμενος ἔστη καὶ περιεπάτει, καὶ εἰσῆλθε σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν περιπατῶν καὶ ἁλλόμενος καὶ αἰνῶν τὸν θεόν. By saying περιπατῶν Luke wished to intimate that the paralytic was now able to walk without any assistance. But the addition ἁλλόμενος rather imparts a comical turn to the narrative, for it represents the man as if he entered the temple and glorified God dancing. It is due to the foregoing ἐξαλλόμενος that the primitive reading ἀγαλλιώμενος (so also Naber) was corrupted to ἁλλόμενος through the classical ἀγαλλόμενος. To this

points the reading of D χαιρόμενος and that of E χαίρων, though added after περιεπάτει.

As regards the form χαιρόμενος it is not 'nihili' as Blass says. It is the MGk form, which was already established in the Hellenistic period as shown by the examples from the second and third centuries registered by Sophocles. It was inevitable that the middle would displace the active voice when the people acquired the middle voice sentiment in accordance with such verbs as ἥδομαι, τέρπομαι, θλίβομαι, ἄχθομαι, etc.

3-12. τί ἀτενίζετε ὡς ἰδίᾳ δυνάμει ἢ εὐσεβείᾳ πεποιηκόσι τοῦ περιπατεῖν αὐτόν; It has already been realized that εὐσεβείᾳ is due to a misreading. Read ἐνεργείᾳ. It is a ἓν διὰ δυοῖν, i. e. ἐνεργείᾳ δυνάμεως. Cf. Eph.3-7 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως. Phil.3-21 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δύνασθαι. Mk 6-14 ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ. Gal.3-5 ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν. Col.1-29 τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει.

3-16. καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ τοῦτον ὃν θεωρεῖτε καὶ οἴδατε ἐστερέωσε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. This and the following clause καὶ ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τὴν ὁλοκληρίαν ταύτην ἀπέναντι πάντων ὑμῶν state essentially the same thing, and one of the two must be an interpolation. I believe it is this one, for its style is far too stilted even for Luke, τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ and τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ being nothing else but one of the usual respectful periphrases (see my note on Lk 4-36) for the simple pronouns αὐτοῦ and αὐτός. It was interpolated after the corruption of ἴασις into πίστις.

καὶ ἡ ἴασις (see next note) ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τὴν ὁλοκληρίαν ταύτην. This hangs together with ὁ θεὸς ἐδόξασε τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, the intervening words being parenthetical. The scope is that God has glorified his son by bestowing upon him such healing powers as would effect the miracle of restoring the lame man.

ἴασις (= *act of curing*) is my correction of the textual πίστις, which is distinctly wrong, for if faith is to cure, it must exist in the person who is to be cured, as is the case in Mt 9-22 and 28. Mk 5-36; but in this passage the faith of the lame man is not brought in. At 4-22 this miracle is called τὸ σημεῖον τοῦτο τῆς ἰάσεως. In the same way πίστις has usurped the place of ἴασις in 1Cor.12-9, causing the intru-

sion of ἄλλῳ δὲ χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων ἐν τῷ ἑνὶ πνεύματι; and at Lk 4-18 I have shown that ἐν ἀφέσει should most probably be corrected by ἐν ἰάσει. I may mention that in the passage from 1Corinthians just quoted there is another error in διακρίσεις πνευμάτων, which should be altered into διακρίσεις ὁραμάτων.

3-19. **ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου.** Another respectful expression for ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου. See my note on 3-16.

3-24. **ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν καὶ κατήγγειλαν τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας.** An idiomatic phrase, which in full would be ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν (=οἱ λαλήσαντες) ἐλάλησαν καὶ κατήγγειλαν; in other words, οἱ λαλήσαντες οὐ μόνον ἐλάλησαν ἀλλὰ καὶ κατήγγειλαν. Cf. Demos.12 ἂν μὲν γὰρ, ὅσα ἄν τις λάβῃ, καὶ σώσῃ = οὐ μόνον λάβῃ ἀλλὰ καὶ σώσῃ. Job.23-13 ὃ αὐτὸς ἠθέλησε καὶ ἐποίησε, etc.

4-3. **τήρησιν.** A synonym of φυλακὴν, *prison*.

4-12. **οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομα ἔστιν ἕτερον ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι.** An allusion probably to the Hebrew meaning of Ἰησοῦς in accordance with Mt 1-21 καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.

4-16. **ὅτι μὲν γὰρ γνωστὸν σημεῖον γέγονε δι'αὐτῶν πᾶσι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Ἰερουσαλὴμ φανερόν.** The word γνωστὸν can only mean *known* or *knowable*, and if it were given this sense, the result would be an absurd sentence, namely, *that a known*, or *knowable, sign was wrought is clear to all*, which to all intents and purposes is the same as *that a clear sign was wrought is clear to all*. In order to avoid I presume this absurdity, the English translators were reduced to paring down and have rendered γνωστὸν by *notable*. I suspect that the original reading was σωστὸν, a word in everyday use to-day in the sense of *right, correct, proper, complete*, see Vlákhos. It is not recorded in Dictionaries of old Greek in this sense, but it has its equivalent in σῶς, which comes from the same root. Cf. Xen.Cyrop.7-4-13 σῶα ἀποδοῦναι τὰ χρήματα. Arist.Lys.488 ἵνα τἀργύριον σῶν παρέχοιμεν. Coraes at Plut. AemP.36, in commenting upon Hom.χ28 νῦν τοι σῶς αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος, states 'ὡς ἂν ἡ συνήθεια φαίη σωστός.' Cf. also ἄσωστον (presumed by Cobet to be an error for ἀβίωτον, not a very felicitous conjecture) βίον in Plut.Alcib.3, which probably means *improper, wrong*. By the change I suggest we obtain this sense: *that a proper* (not a charlatanish) *sign was wrought is clear*.

4-17. **ἀπειλησώμεθα.** Bentley 'forte *ἐπαπειλησώμεθα*.'

4-21. **μηδὲν εὑρίσκοντες τὸ πῶς κολάσωνται.** In accordance with Lk 19-48 *οὐχ εὕρισκον τὸ τί ποιήσωσιν*, here *μηδὲν* stands for a simple *μὴ*, as often. See my note on 23-40.

4-25. **ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαβὶδ παιδός σου εἰπών.** The words *τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν* are in the air where they are placed. Apparently a marginal note intended to follow *Δαβὶδ* as they do in Lk 1-32 *Δαβὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ* and Mk 11-10 *τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαβίδ*.

διὰ πνεύματος = *ἐν πνεύματι*. Cf. Mt 22-43 *Δαβὶδ ἐν πνεύματι κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ*. Jannaris § 1381 'the instrumental dative is sometimes replaced, notably in post-classical Greek, by the preposition *διὰ* [with the genitive].' And *ἐν πνεύματι*=*πνεύματι*; see my note on *πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ὑμῖν* of Lk 1-1.

διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαβίδ. St Luke here affects, as he often loves to do, a Septuagint style as expressive of solemnity. See my note on Lk 1-72.

4-33. **ἀπεδίδουν τὸ μαρτύριον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.** As pointed out in my note on Rom.6-17, *ἀπεδίδουν* stands for *παρεδίδουν*, *ἐδίδασκον*, *taught, preached*, and *τὸ μαρτύριον* does not comport with it in this sense. I therefore incline to think that the right word is *τὸ μυστήριον*. Cf. 1Cor.2-1 *καταγγέλλων ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ*, where likewise *τὸ μαρτύριον* has been substituted in several Mss. Eph.6-19 *γνωρίσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*. Col.4-3 *λαλῆσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. See also my note on Rom.11-25.

5-6. **ἀναστάντες δὲ οἱ νεώτεροι.** There is no idea that the servants were sitting and then rose to perform their duty, as it has been thought. As I mentioned in my note on Lk 1-39 *ἀναστᾶσα δὲ Μαριὰμ ἐπορεύθη*, the participles *ἐγερθεὶς* or *ἀναστὰς* are frequently added simply to indicate the commencement of a movement.

οἱ νεώτεροι. I.e. *οἱ παῖδες*, *servants, porters*, whose business it was to carry out the needful at funerals. So also *νεανίσκοι* in v.10. Compare the MGk *παιδί*[*ον*], the French *garçon* = *waiter* and the Spanish *mozo*.

5-13. **τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμα κολλᾶσθαι αὐτοῖς.** No persons are specified in the foregoing so that here there might be a reference to a rest (*λοιπῶν*). But the Apostles were in a body preaching in Solomon's porch, namely, within the court of the temple over which the Levites

as the servants of the temple had jurisdiction and for order in which they were responsible. I conclude that Luke meant to say that the Levites for fear of the people dared not forbid the Apostles to pursue their work within the court. I read therefore *τῶν δὲ Λευιτῶν οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμα κωλῦσαι αὐτούς*. This also makes *οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμα* intelligible; otherwise, since the people were exalting the Apostles, there was no occasion for diffidence on the part of any one about following them.

5-17. *ἀναστὰς* (see my note on v. 6) **δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ πάντες οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ἐπλήσθησαν ζήλου καὶ ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας.** A rather anomalous construction; in a regular style the sentence would run *ὁ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ πάντες οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ἐπλήσθησαν ζήλου καὶ ἀναστάντες ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας*.

5-17 to 42. These verses did not form part of the original work but are a rechauffé of 4-1 to 22 with the addition of Gamaliel's address. The following parallelism will show this clearly:

5-17. *ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ ἔθεντο αὐτοὺς ἐν τηρήσει*	4-3. *ἐπέβαλον αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ ἔθεντο εἰς τήρησιν*
5-19. *διὰ νυκτὸς ἤνοιξε τὰς θύρας*	4-3. *εἰς τὴν αὔριον, ἦν γὰρ ἑσπέρα ἤδη*
5-21. *ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ συνεκάλεσαν τὸ συνέδριον καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γερουσίαν*	4-5. *συναχθῆναι αὐτῶν τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους καὶ τοὺς γραμματεῖς*
5-26. *οὐ μετὰ βίας, ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ τὸν λαὸν*	4-21. *μηδὲν εὑρίσκοντες τὸ πῶς κολάσωνται αὐτοὺς διὰ τὸν λαὸν*
5-27. *αὐτοὺς ἔστησαν ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν*	4-6. *στήσαντες αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ μέσῳ ἐπυνθάνοντο*
5-29. *πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνθρώποις*	4-19. *εἰ δίκαιόν ἐστιν ὑμῶν ἀκούειν μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ*
5-30. *ἤγειρεν Ἰησοῦν, ὃν ὑμεῖς διεχειρίσασθε κρεμάσαντες*	4-10. *Ἰησοῦ ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε, ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν*
5-40. *προσκαλεσάμενοι τοὺς ἀποστόλους παρήγγειλαν μὴ λαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.*	4-18. *καλέσαντες αὐτοὺς παρήγγειλαν μὴ φθέγγεσθαι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ.*

Then the episode of the angel who opened the prison is a reminiscence of 12-7 ff and probably also of 16-26. Furthermore, Gamaliel's address is pointless, nor is his advice really carried out (though we are told that it was), for the Apostles were not let off, considering that

before discharge they were scourged. In fact, shortly afterwards we have Stephen's episode, when he was put to death in the presence of the chief priest without any interference on his part to save him in conformity with Gamaliel's advice.

5-20. πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης. Probably *ταῦτα*. So Manen.

5-21. παραγενόμενος. As there is no other place indicated, we should have to assume that the chief priest visited *τὸ ἱερὸν*, which is mentioned in the preceding verse. If that were so, however, we would have been told what was his object in repairing there. In the absence of any such information *παραγενόμενος* remains too indefinite to be sound.

5-40. τοὺς ἀποστόλους δείραντες παρήγγειλαν μὴ λαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. It was for the offence of heresy that the Apostles were scourged, in the same way as according to 22-19 Paul at one time was treating the Christians. R. Travers Herford, Christianity in Talmud and Midrash p.336 'Jacob of Ch.N. was called to account by R.Haggai, who ordered him on each occasion to come and be scourged for having given a wrong decision. Jacob asked R.Haggai by what authority he scourged him. The Rabbai quoted texts to show that Jacob's teaching was wrong, after which Jacob lay down and submitted to be scourged.'

6-7. πολύς τε ὄχλος τῶν ἱερέων ὑπήκουον τῇ πίστει. It is beyond belief that a great crowd of priests were converted. A scandal of such sensational magnitude could not have been dismissed with a perfunctory notice, nor could it have remained without grave consequences. Even if Mt 3-7 *ἰδὼν δὲ πολλοὺς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων ἐρχομένους ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα* be genuine, it was one thing to seek purification and quite another to fall in with such a claim as that Jesus was the Messiah. Most likely for *ἱερέων* we should read *Ἑβραίων*, to which the variant *Ἰουδαίων* seems to point.

7-5. ἐπηγγείλατο δοῦναι αὐτῷ (several minuscules ἐπηγγείλατο αὐτῷ δοῦναι, adopted by Souter) εἰς κατάσχεσιν αὐτὴν καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ μετ᾽αὐτόν. This flatly contradicts the preceding *οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κληρονομίαν ἐν αὐτῇ οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδός*, and it is hopeless to strain after explaining the contradiction away. Luke was a gentleman highly cultured, and it is inadmissible that he would have perpetrated such

a palpable incongruity without being struck by it. He must have had in mind Gen.12-7 *ὤφθη κύριος τῷ Ἄβραμ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Τῷ σπέρματί σου δώσω τὴν γῆν ταύτην*, so that he probably wrote *ἐπηγγειλατο αὐτῷ δοῦναι [εἰς κατάσχεσιν] αὐτὴν τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ*, but some transcriber remodelled the quotation in accordance with Gen.48-4 *δώσω σοι τὴν γῆν ταύτην καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου μετὰ σέ*.

7-19. **κατασοφισάμενος τὸ γένος ἡμῶν**. *Having acted villainously towards our race.* As *πανοῦργος* often stands for *σοφὸς*, the reverse may equally obtain and *σοφὸς* be employed in a pejorative sense for *πανοῦργος*. So that *κατασοφισάμενος* most probably means the same as *καταπανουργησάμενος*; cf. Ps.82-4 *ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν σου κατεπανουργήσαντο γνώμην*. In any case the English version *and the same dealt subtilly with our kindred*, or *race*, is not correct; there was no subtlety in Pharaoh's acts—to which *κατασοφισάμενος* refers as does also *κατασοφισώμεθα* of Exod.1-10—but open hostility.

7-20. **ἀστεῖος τῷ θεῷ**. I.e. **ἀστειότατος**. See my note on Lk 1-6.

7-25. **ἐνόμιζε δὲ συνιέναι τοὺς ἀδελφούς**. I do not see the point of *ἐνόμιζε*. Probably *ἤρμοζε* or *ἐνήρμοζε*, *it was fitting on the part of the brethren that they should understand.*

7-38. **οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ μετὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σινᾶ καὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν**. The syntax generally adopted of connecting *τῶν πατέρων* with *μετὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου*, i. e. *μετὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου καὶ τῶν πατέρων*, appears to me unsatisfactory; what was the object of emphasizing such a fact as that Moses was in the desert with the Jewish ancestors, especially since it was already said in the preceding verse that Moses spoke to them? The author's intention was I think to convey that the angel spoke to Moses and the ancestors, and therefore that *τῶν πατέρων* stands for the dative, a usage which is now thoroughly established; see Jannaris § 1350 and Hatzidakis, Einleitung p.223. Cf.Act.Petr. et Andr.5 *δὸς τοὺς βόας τοῦ κυρίου αὐτῶν* = *give the oxen to their owner*, and further on *ἀνάγγειλον τῇ γυναικί σου καὶ τῶν τέκνων σου* = *inform thy wife and thy children*, a mixing of the cases as in our passage. It would, however, be unfair to tax Luke with such grossly unscholarly grammar, and I surmise that *καὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν* does not come from his pen.

7-42. **ἔστρεψε δὲ ὁ θεὸς καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς λατρεύειν τῇ στρατιᾷ**

τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Blass points out the difficulty of translating ἔστρεψε by *turned*, and suggests that the right reading might be διέστρεψε.

The notion that God in his wrath distorts the minds of sinners and involves them in additional sin exists also in Ps.80-12 οὐκ ἤκουσεν ὁ λαός τῆς φωνῆς μου καὶ Ἰσραὴλ οὐ προσέσχε μοι, καὶ ἐξαπέστειλα αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν· πορεύσονται ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν αὐτῶν. Cf. further Mt 13-15 ἐπαχύνθη ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶ βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν, μήποτε ἴδωσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσι καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσι καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσι καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς. Rom.1-28 καθὼς οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα. 2Thes.2-10 τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἐδέξαντο, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πέμπει αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς ἐνέργειαν πλάνης εἰς τὸ πιστεῦσαι αὐτοὺς τῷ ψεύδει, ἵνα κριθῶσι πάντες οἱ μὴ πιστεύσαντες τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἀλλ' εὐδοκήσαντες τῇ ἀδικίᾳ. Compare further Lycourg.Leoc.92 οἱ γὰρ θεοὶ οὐδὲν πρότερον ποιοῦσιν ἢ τῶν πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν διάνοιαν παράγουσι, where Euripides's iambics are quoted ὅταν γὰρ ὀργὴ δαιμόνων βλάπτῃ τινά, τοῦτ' αὐτὸ πρῶτον, ἐξαφαιρεῖται φρενῶν τὸν νοῦν τὸν ἐσθλόν, εἰς δὲ τὴν χείρω τρέπει γνώμην, ἵν' εἰδῇ μηδὲν ὧν ἁμαρτάνει. Hom.Σ 311 ἐκ γάρ σφεων (Leeuwen et Costa σφι) φρένας εἵλετο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη. This was a hackneyed notion, hence the proverb μωραίνει κύριος ὃν βούλεται ἀπολέσαι, a most unkind thought.

7-44. καθὼς διετάξατο ποιῆσαι αὐτήν. Regarding καθὼς αὐτὴν = ἣν see my note on 10-38.

7-51. ἀπερίτμητοι καρδίαις καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν. Probably καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶ βαρεῖς.

7-59. τὸν Στέφανον ἐπικαλούμενον καὶ λέγοντα. Bentley considered that either $\overline{\theta\nu}$ (θεὸν) dropped out after [ἐπικαλούμεν]ον or $\overline{\kappa\nu}$ (κύριον) before καὶ [λέγοντα].

8-1. Σαῦλος δὲ ἦν συνευδοκῶν τῇ ἀναιρέσει αὐτοῦ. This information, coming so closely upon what we are told in 7-58, i.e. that the witnesses against Stephen laid down their garments at the feet of Saul, seems to me entirely superfluous.

8-2. συνεκόμισαν δὲ τὸν Στέφανον ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς καὶ ἐποίησαν κοπετὸν μέγαν ἐπ' αὐτῷ. Not in their proper place; they should be restored after καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐκοιμήθη of 7-60. De Bèze placed them after τῇ ἀναιρέσει of 8-1.

8-4. διασπαρέντες διῆλθον εὐαγγελιζόμενοι. The aorist is unsuitable both here and at 10-38; cf. v. 40 διερχόμενος εὐηγγελίζετο. Probably διῆγον. For διάγειν with a participle = *to continue doing* what the participle denotes see Liddell and Scott.

8-7. πολλοὶ γὰρ τῶν ἐχόντων πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα, βοῶντα φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, ἐξήρχοντο. Blass 'lectio πολλοὶ anacoluthiam habet vel in mediocri scriptore intolerabilem.' Quite so, but the primitive reading was πολλοῖς, an ethical dative, to which point D παρὰ πολλοῖς and d *a multis*.

8-23. εἰς γὰρ χολὴν πικρίας καὶ σύνδεσμον ἀδικίας ὁρῶ σε ὄντα. I cannot discern any sense in εἶναι εἰς χολὴν (= ἐν χολῇ, see Jannaris § 1548), nor does χολὴ denote, as we should have expected, anything parallel to σύνδεσμος. I suggest σχολὴν πορνείας, the meaning being *for I see thee belonging to a heathenish school and to an association of iniquity*, not to an association of peace (cf. Ephes.4-3 ἐν τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης). We would thus obtain a parallelism between σχολὴν and σύνδεσμον and another between πορνείας and ἀδικίας. There occur several such combinations in which figures πορνεία; cf.2Cor.12-21 τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ πορνείᾳ. Rom.1-29 πεπληρωμένους πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ, πορνείᾳ. Hos.6-9 ἀνομίαν ἐποίησαν, εἶδον πορνείαν τοῦ Ἐφραΐμ. Jer.3-2 ἐν ταῖς πορνείαις σου καὶ ἐν ταῖς κακίαις σου. 13-27 ἡ ἀτιμία σου καὶ ἡ μοιχεία σου. Jez.23-27 τὰς ἀσεβείας σου καὶ τὴν πορνείαν σου. 23-29 αἰσχύνη πορνείας σου καὶ ἀσέβειά σου. 23-35 λάβε τὴν ἀσέβειάν σου καὶ τὴν πορνείαν σου. Corruptions of πορνεία I have indicated in my note on Rom.1-29, referring to 1Cor.5-8. Sir.41-17. Is.47-10. Jer.13-27. XII Patr.Reub. 3-3. 4-11. Jud.14-2. Dan.5-5. And at this passage when σχολὴν was corrupted into χολὴν, it was easy for πορνείας to lapse into πικρίας owing to the association of gall with bitterness; cf. Deut.29-18 ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ. However, the sentence reads like a quotation, and until the original is traced, nothing really reliable as to the genuine form of the sentence can be advanced.

πορνείαν. In its general sense of a *bad* or heathenish *act*, as often.

σύνδεσμον. *Association* in a pejorative sense, *conspiracy*, of which Sophocles registers two instances, i. e. 4Kings11-14 and Jer.11-9.

8-39. ὅτε δὲ ἀνέβησαν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, πνεῦμα κυρίου ἥρπασε τὸν Φίλιππον καὶ οὐκ εἶδεν αὐτὸν οὐκέτι ὁ εὐνοῦχος, ἐπορεύετο γὰρ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ χαίρων. Φίλιππος δὲ εὑρέθη εἰς Ἄζωτον. I cannot believe that Luke is responsible

for this childish tale. I suspect that originally the text read *ἐπορεύθη*, and when this was corrupted into *εὑρέθη*, a miracle was imagined and the story of Philip being carried away by a spirit was concocted. The original text ran probably thus: *ὅτε δὲ ἀνέβησαν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, ὁ μὲν εὐνοῦχος ἐπορεύετο τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ χαίρων, Φίλιππος δὲ ἐπορεύθη εἰς Ἄζωτον.* For a similar fiction see my note on Jn 5-3.

9-7. **οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ συνοδεύοντες αὐτῷ εἱστήκεισαν ἐννεοὶ, ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς, μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες.** An evident copy of Dan.10-7 *ἴδον ἐγὼ Δανιὴλ μόνος τὴν ὀπτασίαν, καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ μετ' ἐμοῦ οὐκ ἴδον τὴν ὀπτασίαν, ἀλλὴ* (see my note on Rom.14-14) *ἔκστασις μεγάλη ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ' αὐτούς.* Soph.Aj.15 *εὐμαθές σου, κἂν ἄποπτος ᾖς ὅμως, φώνημ' ἀκούω.* See my notes on 10-14. 17-18. 17-22, and more particularly 27-19.

9-16. **ἐγὼ γὰρ ὑποδείξω αὐτῷ ὅσα δεῖ αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματός μου παθεῖν.** The verb *ὑποδείκνυμι* occurs in five other places of the New Testament, and its meaning in every case is *to teach*, the force of the preposition being the same as in *ὑπογράφω, ὑπογραμμὸς, ὑφηγοῦμαι.* And *παθεῖν* does not accord with such a sense of *ὑποδείξω*, for it is irrational to say that Paul would be *taught* what he was to suffer. For *παθεῖν* to be right we should have not *ὑποδείξω* but something like *ἀπαγγελῶ, λαλήσω, προερῶ* (cf.1Thes.3-4 *προλέγομεν ὑμῖν ὅτι μέλλομεν θλίβεσθαι*). Therefore I think that it is wrong, having displaced *ποιεῖν* or perhaps *πράσσειν*, as is made certain by v. 6 *λαληθήσεταί σοι ὅ τι σε δεῖ ποιεῖν* and by 22-10 *πορεύου εἰς Δαμασκὸν κἀκεῖ σοι λαληθήσεται περὶ πάντων ὧν τέτακταί σοι ποιῆσαι.* This is besides what we should have expected, namely, that Paul would be told what it was his duty to do. The change consciously or unconsciously must have come about at the time when the minds of Christians were full of the merit of martyrdom.

9-34. **ἀνάστηθι καὶ στρῶσον σεαυτῷ.** Expositors supply *τὴν κλίνην* and interpret *arise and make thy bed.* But in this way Peter is made to tell Aeneas to rise from his bed and return to it. What we must supply is *φαγεῖν*, that is to say, Aeneas was to rise from his bed and make a couch ready so that he might recline there and refresh himself. So in Mk 14-15 *ἀνώγαιον ἐστρωμένον* denotes an upper room with the *στρωμναὶ*, i. e. the couches upon which the *σύνδειπνοι* were to recline, made ready. Cf. also Herod.9-82 *κλίνας εὖ ἐστρωμένας καὶ*

παρασκευὴν μεγαλοπρεπέα τοῦ δείπνου. Jud.12-25 *ἔστρωσεν αὐτῇ τὰ κώδια ἃ ἔλαβε εἰς τὸ ἐσθίειν.* Amos 6-4 *κατασπαταλῶντες ἐπὶ ταῖς στρωμναῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἔσθοντες, stretching upon their couches wantonly and feasting.* Ezek.23-41 *ἐκάθου ἐπὶ κλίνης ἐστρωμένης καὶ τράπεζα κεκοσμημένη πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῆς.* In MGk *στρώνω τὸ τραπέζι* or simply *στρώνω* means *to lay the tablecloth etc* in preparation for the meal. Peter on this occasion did what Jesus did according to Mk 5-43, where it is said that when the damsel rose up he bade her friends let her partake of food. Cf. also Evang.1Thom.17 *σοὶ λέγω, βρέφος, ζῆσον, καὶ εὐθὺς ἀναβλέψας ἐγέλασεν. Εἶπε δὲ τῇ γυναικὶ Ἄρον αὐτὸ καὶ δὸς γάλα.*

9-39. **ὅσα ἐποίει μετ'αὐτῶν οὖσα ἡ Δορκάς.** The same as *ὅσα ἐποίει αὐτοῖς ἡ Δορκὰς ζῶσα, those things which Dorkas did to them* (for them) *when alive.* Cf. 10-2 *ποιῶν ἐλεημοσύνας τῷ λαῷ.* Lk 8-39 *διηγοῦ ὅσα ἐποίησέ σοι ὁ θεός.* For *μετ'αὐτῶν = αὐτοῖς* see my note on Apoc.14-13, where I have referred to Mk 6-50 *ἐλάλησε μετ'αὐτῶν.* Lk 10-36 *ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος μετ'αὐτοῦ.* Tob.12-6 *ἐποίησα μεθ'ὑμῶν.* 2Esdr.6-8 *μή ποτέ τι ποιήσητε μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων (= τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, κατὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων).* Bloomfield at Acts 14-27 *ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς μετ'αὐτῶν* calls this usage a Hebraism.

οὖσα = *ζῶσα.* Cf. Mt 2-18 *κλαίουσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσίν.* 24-30 *εἰ ἦμεν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν.* Mk 1-13 *ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων.* Rom.8-5 *οἱ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες* (cf. 8-12 *κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν*), etc.

10-10. **παρασκευαζόντων δὲ αὐτῶν.** No persons being mentioned in the foregoing to whom *αὐτῶν* could be applied, the reading *ei, αὐτῷ*, which is recorded in an old Latin, is preferable. Blass deletes *αὐτῶν*, but then how are we to account for its presence? Both Baljon and Soden suppress the variant *ei*, but it is registered by Tischendorf, who can be shown by this and several other instances to be unreplaceable. The subject of *παρασκευαζόντων* is impersonal. Cf. 21-10 *ἐπιμενόντων δὲ ἡμέρας πλείους, κατῆλθέ τις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας.* 21-31 *ζητούντων αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι, ἀνέβη φάσις.* Mt 17-14 *ἐλθόντων πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον, προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ.* Herod.5-11 *τελεωθέντων δὲ ἀμφοτέροισι, οὗτοι μὲν κατὰ εἵλοντο ἐτράπησαν.* Thuc.4-135 *αἰσθομένων, ἀπήγαγε πάλιν τὴν στρατιὰν*, and often.

10-11. *τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς καθιέμενον.* I.e. *τέσσαρσιν ἄκροις.* Cf. Eur. Hippol.762 *ἐκδήσαντο πλεκτὰς πεισμάτων ἀρχάς.*

10-14. **Μηδαμῶς, κύριε, ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔφαγον πᾶν κοινὸν καὶ ἀκάθαρτον.** Copied from Ezek.4-14 *Μηδαμῶς, κύριε, ἡ ψυχή μου οὐ μεμίανται ἐν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ, οὐδὲ εἰσελήλυθεν εἰς τὸ στόμα μου πᾶν κρέας ἕωλον.* See my note on 27-19.

10-30. **ἀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας μέχρι ταύτης τῆς ὥρας ἤμην τὴν ἐννάτην προσευχόμενος.** This can only mean *since four days ago until this hour I have been saying my prayer of the ninth hour*, and it has been recognized that such a sense is unsuitable. It seems to me that we must follow the variant *τὴν ἐννάτην ὥραν* and eliminate *τῆς ὥρας*; compendiously *ὥρας* and *ὥραν* could be written *ὥρᾱ*, and if this was missed and noted at the margin, it could mistakenly have been combined with *ταύτης* instead of with *τὴν ἐννάτην*. By this correction we obtain the meaning *since four days ago until this*, i.e. counting from this; cf. Gen.31-2 *χθὲς καὶ τρίτην ἡμέραν*. 1Mac.9-44 *οὐ γάρ ἐστι σήμερον ὡς χθὲς καὶ τρίτην ἡμέραν*. Lucian,Halc.3 *ἑώρακας τρίτην ἡμέραν* (= *before yesterday*) *ὅσος ἦν ὁ χειμών*. Herod.6-86 *κατὰ τρίτην γενεὰν τὴν ἀπ' ἐμέο*. Cornelius had in his mind to say that he had been praying all these four days at his usual ninth hour, but the apparition occurred during his prayer of four days ago.

10-33. **καλῶς ἐποίησας παραγενόμενος.** *I thank thee for having come.* This idiom of rendering thanks recurs in 15-29 *ἐξ ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς εὖ πράξετε, from which if you keep yourselves we shall be thankful to you*; its meaning comes out clearly in Phil.4-14 *καλῶς ἐποιήσατε συγκοινωνήσαντές μου τῇ θλίψει, I thank you for having sympathized with me in my sorrow.* Expositors apparently have not perceived what this idiom represents, but Hunt has done so, for in Oxyr.Pap.1189 *εὖ ποιήσεις κομισάμενος* and 1215 *καλῶς ποιήσεις ἐλθὼν* he translates respectively *kindly receive* and *please come*. Similarly 3Jn 6 *καλῶς ποιήσεις προπέμψας ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ*. 3Kings 8-18 *καλῶς ἐποίησας ὅτι ἐγενήθη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν σου, I thank thee for having thought of it.* 1Mac.11-43 *καλῶς ποιήσεις ἀποστείλας μοι ἄνδρας οἳ συμμαχήσουσιν*. Lucian,Icar.13 *ἥκω σε ἀπολύσων τῆς παρούσης ἀπορίας. Εὖ γε ἐποίησας, ἦν δ' ἐγώ*. Char. 24. Harmon.1. Plat.Lys.204a *ἡδέως ἄν σοι μεταδιδοῖμεν. Καλῶς, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ποιοῦντες*. Similarly Soph.Aj.94 *καλῶς ἔλεξας, I thank thee for thy* kind *words.*

10-37. **οἴδατε τὸ γενόμενον ῥῆμα καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ**

τῆς Γαλιλαίας. The construction is inextricably tangled, and therefore Blass looks upon ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας as an interpolation from Lk 23-5 διδάσκων καθ'ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας. That we have before us an interpolation is evident, but the question is as to where it has been intruded, whether in the Acts or in Luke. I think that in Luke, because the clause there should run διδάσκων καθ'ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, namely without the conjunctive, its addition being explicable if it introduces a marginal comment; and on the other hand, if in our passage ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας be transferred after Ἱερουσαλὴμ of v. 39 ἡμεῖς μάρτυρες πάντων ὧν ἐποίησεν ἔν τε τῇ χώρᾳ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, all would run smoothly and logically, and moreover the two passages would then coincide.

10-38. Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ. These words, being connected with τὸ γενόμενον ῥῆμα of the preceding verse, should have had the form περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ; but the Evangelist had them in his mind as an object to ἤγειρε of v. 40 τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρε, where they are repeated as τοῦτον.

ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτόν. The same as ὃν ἔχρισεν; see my notes on Jn 1-16 and Rom.8-29, where I refer to Mk 14-72 τὸ ῥῆμα ὡς (= ὅτι) εἶπεν. Lk 22-61 τοῦ λόγου ὡς εἶπεν. Acts 7-44 ἡ σκηνὴ καθὼς διετάξατο ποιῆσαι αὐτὴν (καθὼς αὐτὴν = ἣν).

διῆλθεν. Probably διῆγεν. See note on 8-4.

12-2. ἀνεῖλε δὲ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰωάννου μαχαίρᾳ. Spurious. A marginal note by a fanatic who took the present opportunity to hold up Herod to execration as pushing his iniquities to the point of having James, John's brother, beheaded. If this James was executed at all, which is exceedingly doubtful, it was not at this precise moment, for James, to whom Peter refers at v. 17, is John's brother, and not the Lord's brother as is generally assumed from a desire to reconcile the statement in this verse with that of v.17. It is highly improbable that Peter would have wished to communicate with the Lord's brother who so far had been a sort of *persona muta*, and not with the son of Zebedee who from the beginning was his coworker in the apostolic history. In Gal.1-19 τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου must be equally spurious, because he is represented as an apostle whereas he was not.

12-12. **συνιδὼν δὲ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Μαρίας.** It is supposed that *συνιδὼν* reiterates the foregoing *νῦν οἶδα ἀληθῶς*, on which supposition its object can only be the same as that of *οἶδα*, i.e. *ὅτι ἐξαπέστειλε κύριος τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξείλετό με ἐκ χειρὸς Ἡρώδου*. But why should the consequence of such a thought have been to move Peter to betake himself to the house of Mary? My opinion is that *συνιδὼν* is corrupt; what we should have expected is a word denoting *at once* or *eagerly* or *rapidly*. Accordingly Hammond conjectured *σπεύδων*; but the original word was rather *συντείνων, hurrying*. Sophocles registers four examples from Dionysios of Halicarnassos, Philo, and Plutarch. Add Philostr.Apoll.2-33 *ἐχώρουν συντείνων*. 4-17 *ἀνῆει ξυντείνας*. 6-5 *ἀνδρὶ ἀλύοντι μᾶλλον ἢ ξυντείνοντι*. Polyb.5-47-4 *σύντονος πορεία*. Eur.Bac. 1091 *σύντονα δρομήματα*. Wetstein and Meyer marshal a number of instances where *συνιδὼν* is met with. Naturally it must often occur, but the point is as to its business here; the explanations given are surmises for which there does not exist the slightest support in the text.

12-20. **πείσαντες Βλάστον.** *Having paid* or *bribed*. Cf. Xen.Mem.3-11-1 *γυναικὸς οὔσης ἐν τῇ πόλει καλῆς καὶ οἵας συνεῖναι τῷ πείθοντι*. Liddell and Scott refer to this passage and Lys.110-13. Xen.An.1-3-9, as well as to Arist.Vesp. *ἀναπεπεισμένος*. The English version *having made Blastos their friend* is unwarranted.

12-23. **ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἄγγελος κυρίου ἀνθ' ὧν οὐκ ἔδωκε δόξαν τῷ θεῷ.** Interpreters have misunderstood this passage to mean that Herod was punished for not leaving to God alone the glory due to him but arrogating it to himself by acquiescing in the impious flattery of the Tyrians. But *δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ* simply means *to pray to God*, cf. 1Kings 6-5 *δώσετε τῷ κυρίῳ δόξαν ὅπως κουφίσῃ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἀφ' ὑμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν* (read *υἱῶν*) *ὑμῶν*, etc. And the prayer often is for forgiveness; cf. Jn 9-24 (see my note) *δὸς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ, ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν ὅτι ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος ἁμαρτωλός ἐστιν, pray to God* that thou be forgiven, for *this man* with whom thou hast come in contact *is, as we know, a sinner*. Apoc.16-9 *οὐ μετενόησαν δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ, they did not repent so as to pray to God* for forgiveness. 11-13 *ἀπεκτάνθησαν ὀνόματα ἀνθρώπων χιλιάδες ἑπτὰ, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἔμφοβοι ἐγένοντο καὶ ἔδωκαν δόξαν τῷ θεῷ, they prayed to God* for forgiveness. 1Esdr.9-7 *ἠνομήσατε τοῦ προσθεῖναι ἁμαρτίας τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ νῦν δότε ὁμολογίαν*

δόξαν τῷ θεῷ. In Josh.7-19, when a crime is brought home to Achar, Joshua tells him δὸς δόξαν σήμερον τῷ κυρίῳ, *pray to-day to the Lord* for forgiveness. So is it in this passage. What the Tyrians shouted was a blasphemy, and Herod was punished for not deprecating that blasphemy by praying to God for forgiveness. Such is the Greek feeling to this day, for the Greeks look upon a blasphemy as a sort of infectious sin, and on hearing one they often cross themselves and exclaim θεὸς φυλάξοι, that is to say, *God save us* from such a sin and forgive us.

The above sentence having been misunderstood from ancient times to mean that the glory which was addressed to Herod should have been addressed to God has caused the addition of the article to δόξαν; but most witnesses record simply δόξαν, and Tischendorf remarks 'dici solet δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ, cf. Lk 17-18. Jn 9-24. Rom.4-20, quorum locorum nullo lectio fluctuat,' but in spite of this just remark he adopts τὴν δόξαν in obedience to the combined authority of ℵ B, logic thus being sacrificed to a theory. My interpretation of course does not admit of the article.

13-8. **ζητῶν διαστρέψαι τὸν ἀνθύπατον ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως.** Valkenaer ἀποστρέψαι in accordance with 3-26 ἀποστρέφειν ἕκαστον ἀπὸ τῶν πονηριῶν.

13-11. **περιάγων ἐζήτει χειραγωγούς.** If in order to walk after the loss of his eyesight Elymas needed assistants to lead him by the hand, he could not go about by himself. That is, however, what the text states. I thought at one time that perhaps not περιάγων but περιαλγῶν, *in great distress*, might be the original reading, the corruption being the same as in XII Patr.Zab.6-5, where there is a variant συνάγων for συναλγῶν. I think now that Paul's curse affected Elymas in the manner of the following imprecations: Deut.28-28 πατάξαι σε κύριος ἀορασίᾳ καὶ ἔσει ψηλαφῶν μεσημβρίας ὡς εἴ τις ψηλαφήσαι τυφλὸς ἐν τῷ σκότει. Job 5-14 ἡμέρας συναντήσεται αὐτοῖς σκότος, τὸ δὲ μεσημβρινὸν ψηλαφήσαισαν ἴσα νυκτί. Isa.59-10 ψηλαφήσουσιν ὡς τυφλοὶ τοῖχον. It is therefore much more likely that the original word was a synonym of ψηλαφῶν, and that if so it must be περιψαύων, *groping round*. Compare Hesychius v. ψαλάσσει 'ψηλαφᾷ, ψαύει.' Also Hom. θ195 καί κ'ἀλαὸς διακρίνειε σῆμα ἀμφαφάων, *groping*

round; see Coraes, Ἄτακτα vol.4 p.398. Probably Elymas's episode was suggested by the imprecations just quoted; see my note on 27-19.

13-12. **ἐκπλησσόμενος ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ κυρίου.** What caused Sergius amazement was the miracle that had just been wrought, and miracles did not ensue through διδαχῇ but *δυνάμει*.

13-15. **λόγος παρακλήσεως.** *A word of instruction.* See my note on Lk 3-18.

13-18. **ὡς τεσσαρακονταετῆ χρόνον.** I.e. *ἕως τεσσαρακοστὸν ἔτος, until the fortieth year.* For ὡς = ἕως (as in MGk) cf. Mk 4-27 *μηκύνεται* ὡς *ἐκάθευδεν* (Mss *οὐκ οἶδεν*). Jn 2-23 ὡς δὲ *ἦν ἐν* Ἱεροσολύμοις. 12-35 *περιπατεῖτε* ὡς *τὸ φῶς ἔχετε*. 36 ὡς *τὸ φῶς ἔχετε πιστεύετε*.

13-23. **ἤγαγε τῷ Ἰσραὴλ σωτῆρα.** The combination *ἄγω σωτῆρα* is unheard of, nor is it logical. A variant, however, *ἤγειρε*, well supported, is the verb suitable at this place as demonstrated by v. 22 *ἤγειρε τὸν Δαβὶδ εἰς βασιλέα* and other passages. But theory in this case has again prevailed over logic and the usage of language. A similar corruption at 14-2, where D exhibits *ἐπήγαγον* for *ἐπήγειραν*. Cf. chiefly 5-30 *ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ἤγειρεν Ἰησοῦν*, which is virtually a reproduction of our passage. Cf. also Mt 24-11 *ψευδοπροφῆται ἐγερθήσονται*.

13-27. **τοῦτον ἀγνοήσαντες καὶ τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας κρίναντες ἐπλήρωσαν.** That there is something amiss in this passage it is evident. As usual, several well-meant attempts have been made at obviating the impossibility of the construction; but fruitlessly. I think the reading originally was *τοῦτον, ἀγνοήσαντες τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας, κρίναντες ἐφήλωσαν, him they, having failed to fathom the voices of the prophets though read every sabbath, brought to judgement and nailed up,* crucified. Cf. 2-36 *τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε*. 4-10 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *τοῦ* Ναζωραίου *ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε*. Herod. 9-120 *σανίδι* (Mss *σανίδα*) *προσπασσαλεύσαντες*.

13-28. **μηδεμίαν αἰτίαν θανάτου εὑρόντες ᾐτήσαντο Πιλάτον ἀναιρεθῆναι αὐτόν.** It is untrue that the elders found no fault in Jesus such as would render him liable to capital punishment; on the contrary, all along that is what they had been intent upon proving. It was Pilate who found no cause for condemnation, as Luke tells us in 23-4 *ὁ δὲ*

Πιλάτος εἶπε πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ τοὺς ὄχλους Οὐδὲν εὑρίσκω αἴτιον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ. I emend therefore εὑρόντος, i. e. τοῦ Πιλάτου. In pedantically strict grammar we should have εὑρόντα in agreement with Πιλάτον; but cf. 4-1 λαλούντων αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸν λαὸν ἐπέστησαν αὐτοῖς. Thuc.4-41-4 πολλάκις φοιτώντων αὐτοὺς ἀπράκτους ἀπέπεμπον. Heracl.4 κακοὶ μάρτυρες ἀνθρώποισιν ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ὦτα βαρβάρους ψυχὰς ἐχόντων. Aeneas,10-22 γενομένου αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ Ἰμέρᾳ, πέμψας ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν περιμένειν, etc.

13-40. θαυμάσατε καὶ ἀφανίσθητε. From Habac.1-5 θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια καὶ ἀφανίσθητε. Therefore ἀφανίσθητε is right here; but probably it is wrong in the LXX, where perhaps the genuine reading is φωτίσθητε or ἐνωτίσθητε.

13-42f. Ἐξιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν παρεκάλουν εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ σάββατον λαληθῆναι αὐτοῖς τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα. Λυθείσης δὲ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἠκολούθησαν πολλοὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ τῶν σεβομένων προσηλύτων τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ, οἵτινες προσλαλοῦντες αὐτοῖς ἔπειθον αὐτοὺς προσμένειν τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ. These verses are highly suspicious. If, as they state, a great number of Jews were converted, Paul ought to have felt elated at the extraordinary success of his preaching, whereas in the subsequent verses we see him in a highly indignant mood against the Jews as a body, to the extent that he shakes off at them the dust of his feet. Besides in vv. 45 and 50 it is all the Jews without exception that appear as his opponents and persecutors.

μεταξύ. Preferably ἑξῆς as in D and other Mss. Cf. v. 44 τῷ δὲ ἐρχομένῳ σαββάτῳ.

14-1. ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν Ἰκονίῳ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν. The English versions follow the Vulgate *simul* and render κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ by *together*. But Blass ‘recte Gigas *similiter* (K. Schmidt), pessime vulg. *simul*,’ comparing Lk 17-30 κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ and Acts 17-2 κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς τῷ Παύλῳ. The latter passage runs as follows: εἰς Θεσσαλονίκην ὅπου ἦν συναγωγὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, κατὰ δὲ τὸ εἰωθὸς τῷ Παύλῳ εἰσῆλθε πρὸς αὐτούς, and its similarity with the passage under comment is unmistakable. Cf. also Herod.4-155 κατὰ ταὐτὰ ἐθέσπιζέ οἱ καὶ πρότερον.

14-27. ἐποίησεν μετ᾽ αὐτῶν. The same as ἐποίησεν αὐτοῖς. See my note on 9-39.

15-10. τί πειράζετε τὸν θεὸν ἐπιθεῖναι ζυγὸν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τῶν

μαθητῶν, ὃν οὔτε οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οὔτε ἡμεῖς ἰσχύσαμεν βαστάσαι; An anachronism similar to that of Jn 7-19 οὐ Μωσῆς ἔδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν Νόμον; Καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν ποιεῖ τὸν Νόμον, where I have commented as follows: 'It was in later times, when the controversy with regard to circumcision was raging and the Jews were insisting upon conformity to the Mosaic Law, that the argument was devised of the Jews themselves not conforming to the Law, inasmuch as by the destruction of Jerusalem they could no longer continue the prescribed sacrifices which according to the Law should be performed exclusively there.'

15-14. ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. I.e. λαβεῖν ἑαυτῷ λαὸν ἐξ ἐθνῶν, *to take to himself*, to adopt, *a people out of the nations* or heathen. Cf. Deut.4-34 ἐπείρασεν ὁ θεὸς εἰσελθὼν λαβεῖν ἑαυτῷ ἔθνος. For τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ = ἑαυτῷ see my note on Lk 4-36.

15-16. μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαβὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν, καὶ τὰ κατεστραμμένα αὐτῆς ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτὴν, ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν κύριον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς. Out of this quotation the only essential part is *ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν κύριον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς*. It was a frequent practice of quoting a whole passage as it was popularly quoted as a proverb, though only a part of it was applicable to the idea which it was intended to illustrate. See my note on Rom. 4-7 and 8, where I have referred as other instances of this practice to Rom.8-36. 9-9. 9-17. 1Cor.3-16. And I have explained at Rom.3-4 that even the essential words have to be understood not in the exact original form but so modified as to fit the idea of the author, as at Rom.15-3. 1Cor.1-31. 1Pet.2-7. XII Patr.Sim.6-2, etc. In our passage the words *ἐφ'οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου* must be understood in the form *ἐφ'οὓς ἐπικληθήσεται τὸ ὄνομά μου*. In early Christian works this peculiarity, one might say this eccentricity, was much abused, probably in imitation of the style of Jewish doctors.

15-29. εὖ πράξετε. *We shall be indebted to you*; see my note on 10-33.

16-17. ἔκραζε λέγουσα Οὗτοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι δοῦλοι τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου εἰσὶν, οἵτινες καταγγέλλουσιν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν σωτηρίας. The damsel, trusting that by an intervention of Paul and his companions she would obtain her deliverance from the evil spirit that was tormenting her, follows them

persistently (κατακολουθοῦσα), exalting them as ministers of the very highest God, men who promised to save or heal mankind. In the end Paul yields to her importunity in the same way as in Mk 7-29 Jesus did when he was beseeched by a widow to cure her demoniacal daughter.

17-11. εὐγενέστεροι. *Better conducted.* The reverse in 2Mac.12-14 ἀναγωγότερον ἐχρῶντο τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἰούδαν.

17-18. ξένων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι. A reminiscence of the history of Socrates; see my note on Lk 1-1.

17-20. τί ἂν θέλοι ταῦτα εἶναι. A reading strongly supported by both Greek witnesses and Latin versions, the sense of which is *what might these things mean*; cf. v. 18 τί ἂν θέλοι and my note on Jn 18-38, where I have adduced numerous examples showing that εἶναι = *to mean*. This was the reading formerly followed, but new theories have now dispossessed it in favour of τίνα θέλει ταῦτα εἶναι, by which the graphic representation of the puzzle in the minds of the inquirers is obliterated.

17-22. Ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, κατὰ πάντα ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ. Luke re-echoes the fame of the Athenians, who owing to the great crowd of statuary in their city were renowned as a people foremost in piety. Their fame is also referred to in Josep.Ap.2-11 τοὺς δὲ (Ἀθηναίους) εὐσεβεστάτους τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἅπαντες λέγουσιν. Paus.1-17-1 τούτοις δὲ (τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις) οὐ τὰ εἰς φιλανθρωπίαν μόνον καθέστηκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ θεοὺς εὐσεβοῦσιν ἄλλων πλέον· καὶ γὰρ Αἰδοῦς σφισι βωμός ἐστι καὶ Φήμης καὶ Ὁρμῆς (read Ὁμφῆς). Philostr.Apoll.6-3 Ἀθήνησιν, οὗ καὶ ἀγνώστων δαιμόνων βωμοὶ ἵδρυνται. Lycurg.Leocr.15 εὖ ἴστε, ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι, ὅτι πλεῖστον διαφέρετε τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων τῷ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβῶς ἔχειν.

δεισιδαιμονεστέρους. There was subtlety on the part of St Paul in addressing the Athenians not θεοσεβεστέρους, which he would have considered was only applicable to worshippers of the one true God, but δεισιδαιμονεστέρους. Such an address must have sounded to them as a compliment, since in their language θεοὶ and δαίμονες were practically synonymous terms, whilst on the other hand it expressed Paul's contempt of their idolatry, for to him δεισιδαίμονες could only mean *worshippers of demons.*

17-23. ἀναθεωρῶν τὰ σεβάσματα ὑμῶν εὗρον καὶ βωμὸν ἐν ᾧ ἐπεγέγραπτο Ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ. Was this suggested by Philostr.Apoll.6-3 Ἀθήνησιν οὗ καὶ ἀγνώστων δαιμόνων βωμοὶ ἵδρυνται?

17-26. **ἐποίησέ τε ἐξ ἑνὸς πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ παντὸς προσώπου τῆς γῆς.** Surely the import intended cannot have been to say that God made every nation dwell on all the face of the earth as the text reads, but that God *from one* progenitor *created every nation that dwells on all the face of the earth.* We have therefore to emend *κατοικοῦν*; cf. Josh.24-18 *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὰ κατοικοῦντα τὴν γῆν*, etc.

ὁρίσας προστεταγμένους καιροὺς καὶ τὰς ὁροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν ζητεῖν τὸν θεόν. A passage grievously corrupt. For (1) after saying that God appointed periodical seasons the text should proceed to enumerate some of the benefits accruing from this periodicity, such for instance as those mentioned in 14-17 *οὐρανόθεν ἡμῖν ὑετοὺς διδοὺς καὶ καιροὺς καρποφόρους, ἐμπιπλῶν τροφῆς καὶ εὐφροσύνης τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν*; and (2) *ζητεῖν τὸν θεὸν* is in the air. The original I have no doubt has suffered an extensive lacuna. Also perhaps some reader, having misunderstood *καιροὺς* to mean *times* and not *seasons* and fancying that the point pressed was that God fixed the present time as the limit for repentance in accordance with v. 30 *τοὺς χρόνους τῆς ἀγνοίας ὑπεριδὼν ὁ θεὸς τανῦν παραγγέλλει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μετανοεῖν*, has inserted *καὶ τὰς ὁροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν* in imitation of Wisd.12-20 *τοὺς χρόνους καὶ τόπον δι'ὧν ἀπαλλαγῶσι τῆς κακίας*. Or these words may have been suggested by Isa.45-18 *ὁ θεὸς ὁ καταδείξας τὴν γῆν καὶ ποιήσας αὐτὴν, αὐτὸς διώρισεν* (compare *ὁρίσας*) *αὐτήν· οὐκ εἰς κενὸν ἐποίησεν αὐτὴν ἀλλὰ κατοικεῖσθαι ἔπλασεν αὐτήν.*

προστεταγμένους καιρούς. Neither *προστεταγμένους* nor the variant *προτεταγμένους* are suitable, the prepositions of both the participles being superfluous after *ὁρίσας*. The other variant *τεταγμένους καιροὺς*, *stated seasons*, is preferable by far.

18-2. **προσῆλθεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ διὰ τὸ ὁμότεχνον εἶναι ἔμενε παρ'αὐτοῖς.** Naber correctly *ὁμότεχνος*.

18-5. **ὡς δὲ κατῆλθον ἀπὸ τῆς Μακεδονίας ὅ τε Σίλας καὶ ὁ Τιμόθεος, συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ ὁ Παῦλος.** What happened was this, that Silas and Timothy came down from Macedonia bringing the collections secured there, those referred to in 2Cor.8-2ff. This timely succour enabled Paul to dispense with his craft, at which he was previously obliged to work, and he was thus freed to devote himself assiduously to his preaching. This assiduous application to the preaching is aptly expressed by

συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ, for *συνέχομαί τινι* in one of its significations (cf. Prov.5-20 *μηδὲ συνέχου ἀγκάλαις τῆς μὴ ἰδίας*) means exactly the same as *προσέχομαί τινι*, cf. *συγκολλῶ* and *προσκολλῶ*; and *προσέχεσθαι* = *to adhere to*, cf. Arist.Vesp.105 *προσεχόμενος τῷ κίονι* (Blaydes *τῇ κιγκλίδι*). Plut.1095 *τὸ γράδιον ὥσπερ λεπὰς τῷ μειρακίῳ προσίσχεται*, where Schol. *προσίσχεται* = *προσκολλᾶται*. In fact, *συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ* is not essentially different to *εἴχετο τοῦ λόγου*, except that by the addition of *σὺν* the object had to be in the dative.

τῷ λόγῳ. *To the preaching.* Cf. 14-12 *ὁ ἡγούμενος τοῦ λόγου, the leader in the preaching.* 20-2 *παρακαλέσας αὐτοὺς λόγῳ πολλῷ.* Lk 10-39 *παρακαθεσθεῖσα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ κυρίου ἤκουε τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ*, etc.

18-18. **κειράμενος τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς, εἶχε γὰρ εὐχήν.** Is this a misunderstanding on the part of St Luke, who probably was not quite clear upon the Jewish customs, or is it an interpolation? Because, so far as I know, the rite of shaving of a Nazirite could only be performed in the temple at Jerusalem.

18-25. **ἐδίδασκεν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.** If, as we are informed in the following verse, Priscilla and Aquila took Apollos aside to teach him more accurate (*ἀκριβέστερον*) Christianity, it is obvious that his knowledge of the matter was inexact. We must therefore read *ἀνακριβῶς* (Sherlock *οὐκ ἀκριβῶς*), the negative having been missed owing to the antecedent [*ἐδίδασκ*]*εν*. An identical error in 24-22, where we find *ἀκριβέστερον* instead of *ἀνακριβέστερον*. Respecting the frequent loss of negatives see my notes on Rom.1-19 and Jn 5-46.

19-2. **εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐλάβετε πιστεύσαντες.** *If you received holy spirit when you became πιστοὶ*, that is, when you were baptized. In my note on Rom.13-11 I commented '*ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν*. Practically = *at the time of our baptism*, for it was by the baptism that men became Christians or believers. So in Acts 19-2 *πιστεύσαντες* is an equivalent of *βαπτισθέντες*, as the following *ἐβαπτίσθητε* shows.'

19-14. **ἦσαν δέ τινος Σκευᾶ, Ἰουδαίου ἀρχιερέως, ἑπτὰ υἱοὶ τοῦτο** (exorcisms) **ποιοῦντες.** Of course it is out of the question that a high priest of Jerusalem and his sons, who were Sadducees swollen with pride, would have demeaned themselves so low as to roam about as exorcists and make a living in so disreputable a manner; nor do I believe that even a provincial chief priest could have so disgraced himself. But

the priestly class practised medicine, most frequently applying occult methods (see Encyclopaedia Biblica v. Medicine, p. 3006), and as a matter of course exorcisms; it is possible therefore that the original lection was not *ἀρχιερέως* but *ἀρχιάτρου ἱερέως*.

19-16. **κατακυριεύσας ἀμφοτέρων ἴσχυσε κατ'αὐτῶν.** This is the same as *κατακυριεύσας ἀμφοτέρων κατεκυρίευσεν αὐτῶν*. One of the two verbs must be wrong.

ἀμφοτέρων. I.e. of the father and the sons.

ἴσχυσε κατ'αὐτῶν. Cf. Dan.(LXX) 8-8 *ὁ τράγος τῶν αἰγῶν κατίσχυσε σφόδρα*.

19-21. **εἰπὼν ὅτι μετὰ τὸ γενέσθαι με ἐκεῖ δεῖ με καὶ Ῥώμην ἰδεῖν.** Probably spurious.

19-28. **μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτεμις Ἐφεσίων.** This apparently was the usual way of cheering. Cf. Heliod.8-9 *ὑπὸ χαρᾶς ἐκβοῆσαι καὶ μεγάλους τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι*. 8-15 *θεούς τε μεγάλους καὶ δίκην ἀνακαλοῦντες*. Wetstein also compares Aristid. p. 292 *ἐβόων δὴ ἐν τῷ ὀνείρατι ὡς ἂν ὕπαρ τε καὶ ἐπ'ὀνείρατι τετελεσμένῳ, Μέγας ὁ Ἀσκληπιός*. 295 *τὸ πολυύμνητον τοῦτο βοώντων Μέγας ὁ Ἀσκληπιός*.

20-9. **καθεζόμενος δέ τις νεανίας ὀνόματι Εὔτυχος ἐπὶ τῆς θυρίδος, κατεχόμενος ὕπνῳ βαρεῖ διαλεγομένου τοῦ Παύλου ἐπὶ πλεῖον** (*who was being overcome by heavy sleep in consequence of Paul's protracted discourse*), **κατενεχθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου ἔπεσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ τριστέγου κάτω καὶ ἤρθη νεκρός. Καταβὰς δὲ ὁ Παῦλος ἐπέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ συμπεριλαβὼν εἶπε.** Paul's object was to bring the youth back to life; and it was believed that to effect such revivals it was necessary not merely to fall upon the dead person but to breathe into him. Cf. Jez.37-9 *ἐμφύσησον εἰς τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ ζησάτωσαν*. In 3Kings 17-21 Elija *ἐνεφύσησε τῷ παιδαρίῳ* when he brought him back to life. In 4Kings 4-34 *ἀνέβη* (Ἐλισαῖος) *καὶ ἐκοιμήθη* (*lay*) *ἐπὶ τὸ παιδάριον καὶ ἔθηκε τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ* it is not expressly stated that Elisha breathed into the child, but this is implied in the saying that he placed his mouth upon the child's mouth. Similarly Evang.Infant.Arab.43 *locum in quo vipera eum momorderat afflavit, quo facto extemplo sanatus est*. The belief in revival by breathing must have originated in Gen.2-7 *ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς*. Thus the original reading I suspect was not *ἐπέπεσεν* but *ἐνέπνευσεν*, which is a synonym of *ἐνεφύσησεν*; cf. Wisd.15-11 *τὸν*

ἐμπνεύσαντα αὐτῷ ψυχὴν ἐνεργοῦσαν καὶ ἐμφυσήσαντα πνεῦμα ζωτικόν. Nor do I feel much confidence in συμπεριλαβών; probably once it was συμπεριβαλὼν, *having covered him with a cloak*, of which verb Sophocles records one example, the preposition having the same force as in συγκαλύπτω. Both errors probably induced by Gen.33-4 περιλαβὼν αὐτὸν προσέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ.

κατεχόμενος ὕπνῳ βαρεῖ. This is the reading of D. Cf. Heliod.5-2 ὕπνῳ καὶ ταῦτα βαθεῖ κατεσχημένον. 6-14 ὕπνῳ κατείχετο. Philostr.Apoll.2-7 κατεσχημένοις τῷ οἴνῳ. 2-36 μέθῃ κατεσχημένους. All other Mss give καταφερόμενος ὕπνῳ βαθεῖ, which is quite as good; cf. Act.Thom.109 εἰς ὕπνον κατηνέχθην βαθύν. Heliod.5-1 εἰς ὕπνον καταφέρει. 5-2 ὑπηνέχθη τῷ ὕπνῳ. Philostr.Apoll.1-5 εἰς ὕπνον ἀπήχθη (no doubt ὑπήχθη). But the reading of D seems to me preferable, because ὕπνος βαθὺς can only apply to a person who was already fast asleep, and not to one who was gradually being overcome by sleep, and this must have been Eutychus's condition as he sat in the window.

κατενεχθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου. *Having been borne down by the sleep.* The rendering *being borne down* is not quite exact. A few Mss omit these words (see Soden), probably because the amanuensis thought them superfluous after καταφερόμενος ὕπνῳ.

20-13. οὕτω γὰρ ἦν διατεταγμένος. *For so had he made his arrangements.* The participle is reflexive = διατεταχὼς ἑαυτῷ.

20-26. διότι. A variant διό. The same variant at Rom.3-20. 1Thes. 2-18. 3-1 (only in B). 1Pet.2-6, and elsewhere. Perhaps διὸ is preferable everywhere.

καθαρός εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος πάντων. The context shows plainly that Paul was not protesting that he had tried his best to safeguard his disciples from punishment in this world, but from the consequences in the next of their perhaps disregarding his preaching. The amanuensis was carried away by his recollection of the familiar phrase in Mt 27-24 ἀθῷός εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ δικαίου τούτου, and unconsciously transcribed αἵματος instead of κρίματος.

20-35. πάντα ὑπέδειξα ὑμῖν. *I have always shewed you.* Expositors have misunderstood πάντα as meaning *all things*; it means *always, ever*, as in MGk, see Vlákhos. Cf. 1Cor.11-2. 13-7 (opposed to the following οὐδέποτε). XII Patr.Iss.3-8. Philos.8-2-12. Orig.Cels.3-57 πάντα

εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἀφορῶντας. Achil.Tat.3-11 πάντα σιγῶσαν. 5-13-3. HerP.3Vis. 6 πάντα ἐπερώτας, where the old Latin version correctly gives *semper*. Lucian, Asin. 22 ἡ δὲ παῖς οὔτε ἐμφαγεῖν τι ἤθελεν οὔτε πιεῖν, ἀλλὰ πάντα ἔκλαεν. ibid. τί γὰρ ἡμῖν δοκεῖ τρέφειν τὸν ὄνον τοῦτον πάντα καταπίπτοντα; Descens.Inf.6-2 *per omnia* = διὰ πάντα, *for ever*. Also ἅπαντα; cf. Achil.Tat.7-16-4. Also classically, as in Arist.Nub.1381 αἰσθανόμενός σου πάντα τραυλίζοντος ὅ τι νοοίης, Hyperid.Lyc.16. But the word, owing to its being rather demotic, was often changed into πάντοτε; so in 1Cor.11-2, where P πάντοτε. 2Cor.7.14. HermP.Mand.10-3, where likewise a variant πάντοτε. In HermP.1Vis.2 the Mss give πάντοτε γελῶν, but the old Latin version is *omnia ridens* translating πάντα literally. In Lucian.54 and Clem.Hom.11-13 it is corrupted into τὰ πάντα. In Eph.1-23 the chief Mss likewise read τὰ πάντα, but a few minuscules have preserved the correct lection πάντα. It stands for πάντα τὸν χρόνον; cf. Dem.1445. Hyperid.Lyc.16 διατρίβων ἐν τῇ πόλει τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον. Herod.8-100 ἦν ταῦτα τὸν πάντα μεταξὺ χρόνον γενόμενα (read γενόμενον). 9-106 φρουρέοντες τὸν πάντα χρόνον. Xen.Mem. 1-4-16 ἐξαπατωμένους τὸν πάντα χρόνον. 2-1-33 τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον ὑμνούμενοι. Philostr.Apoll.7-24 παρθένον οὖσαν τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον. Just.222c. Paus. 2-6-1 πάντα τὸν χρόνον διατελέσασιν. Similarly μικρὸν and μικρὸν χρόνον; cf. Jn 7-33. 13-33. Also ἀκαρῆ in Arist.Nub.496. Most of these examples cited in my note on Rom.8-28.

20-37. ἐπιπεσόντες ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τοῦ Παύλου κατεφίλουν αὐτόν. From Gen.33-4 περιλαβὼν αὐτὸν προσέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν.

21-3. ἀναφάναντες δὲ τὴν Κύπρον καὶ καταλιπόντες αὐτὴν εὐώνυμον. Read ἀποφήναντες; cf. Philostr.Apoll.1-20 τὴν δὴ τῶν ποταμῶν μέσην ὁ Τίγρης ἀποφαίνει καὶ ὁ Εὐφράτης, which shows that ἀποφαίνω is a synonym of ἀπείργω in the sense of Herod.7-43 ἐν ἀριστερῇ ἀπέργων Ῥοίτειον πόλιν.

21-13. τί ποιεῖτε κλαίοντες; *What is the good of weeping?* I have illustrated this force of ποιεῖν in my note on Jn 11-47, quoting 1Cor. 15-29 τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι (read βασανιζόμενοι) ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν; *what is the good of toiling so hard for the sake of men who are dead* for good and all? I added there that the phrase τί ποιοῦμεν survives exactly in MGk in the form τί κάνουμε (= κάμνομεν = ποιοῦμεν) and

that it implies a negative, i.e. *there is no sense in the way we are acting.*

21-23. **εἰσὶν ἡμῖν ἄνδρες τέσσαρες εὐχὴν ἔχοντες ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν· τούτους παραλαβὼν ἁγνίσθητι σὺν αὐτοῖς καὶ δαπάνησον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.** From Numb. 6-14ff, where the details of the purification of Nazirites are recounted, we can see that the expenses of the prescribed rites were very heavy, and poor applicants would be unequal to meeting them. For a certain class of rites it was permissible for the priests to grant a reduction in favour of the poor; cf. Lev.27-8 *ἐὰν δὲ ταπεινὸς ᾖ τῇ τιμῇ* (*if he be too poor compared with the* first *estimate* made as to how much he should pay), *στήσεται ἐναντίον τοῦ ἱερέως καὶ τιμήσεται αὐτὸν ὁ ἱερεύς· καθάπερ ἰσχύει ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ εὐξαμένου τιμήσεται αὐτὸν ὁ ἱερεύς.* But in the above-quoted chapter from Numbers no such reduction is mentioned, and presumably the costs of the purification of Nazirites came within that rule which fixed costs absolutely and allowed no reduction; cf. Exod. 30-15 *ὁ πλουτῶν οὐ προσθήσει καὶ ὁ πενόμενος οὐκ ἐλαττονήσει.* If so, the only way out in the case of impecunious Nazirites was for charitable persons of means to come forward and guarantee payment in their behalf. This is what Paul was asked to do.

ἁγνίσθητι σὺν αὐτοῖς. I have some difficulty in understanding this. If Paul was to be purified jointly with the four Nazirites by the same purification as they, as the text certainly means, he must have been under a vow himself; but such a vow on his part is recorded nowhere; the one mentioned at 18-18 is not applicable.

21-26. **ἁγνισθεὶς εἰσῄει εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν διαγγέλλων τὴν ἐκπλήρωσιν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ ἁγνισμοῦ.** As *ἁγνισθεὶς* and *ἁγνισμοῦ* stand so close together, they are apt to be misunderstood as referring to the same kind of *ἁγνισμὸς*, whereas the former of course denotes the ordinary *ἁγνισμὸς* which every worshipper about to enter the temple had to go through and the latter the special purification of the Nazirites.

διαγγέλλων τὴν ἐκπλήρωσιν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ ἁγνισμοῦ ἕως οὗ προσηνέχθη ὑπὲρ ἑνὸς ἑκάστου αὐτῶν ἡ προσφορά. Expositors in striving to invest the words with some sort of plausible sense have strained their sense to the utmost. They can only mean *announcing the fulfilment of the days of the purification until such time as the offering for every one of them will have been offered* or completed, and it is readily seen that such

a sentence is incoherent. What Paul undertook to do and what we should have expected him to declare is that he was ready to defray, or stand guarantee for, the costs of the purification in behalf of himself and each one of his companions. I read therefore πλήρωσιν for ἐκπλήρωσιν and δαπανῶν (cf. v. 24 δαπάνησον) for ἡμερῶν, i.e. *announcing the payment against the expenses of the purification until such time as the offering in behalf of every one of them will have been offered.* In this way, it seems to me, the stress also laid upon ὑπὲρ ἑνὸς ἑκάστου αὐτῶν is intelligible, Paul emphasizing that he would pay for each and all of his poor companions. The corruption came about probably through the mind of the transcriber being familiar with such current phrases as Lk 2-22 ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ. Tob.8-20 ἐὰν μὴ πληρωθῶσιν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ γάμου. Ezek.5-2 κατὰ τὴν πλήρωσιν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ συγκλεισμοῦ. Dan.10-3 ἕως πληρώσεως τριῶν ἑβδομάδων ἡμερῶν. 1Mac.3-49 τοὺς Ναζιραίους οἳ ἐπλήρωσαν τὰς ἡμέρας. Numb.6-13 οὗτος ὁ νόμος τοῦ εὐξαμένου· ᾗ ἂν ἡμέρᾳ πληρώσῃ ἡμέρας εὐχῆς.

πλήρωσιν. *Payment.* Sophocles registers one example of πλήρωσις in this sense and two of πληρωτὴς = *payer.* Herwerden, Lexicon Graecum Suppletorium 'πληροῦν, (pecuniam) reddere. IGSI 956.' Add Philostr. Apoll.6-2 ἐράνου πλήρωσιν = *subscription to a club* (Conybeare). In MGk πληρώνω, πληρωμὴ, πληρωτὴς are current and specific terms for *to pay, payment, payer.*

ἕως οὗ προσηνέχθη. *Until* the προσφορὰ *will have been offered.* Alford aptly refers to Plato, Gorg.506 ἡδέως ἂν διελεγόμην ἕως ἀπέδωκα. Crat. 396 οὐκ ἂν ἐπαυόμην ἕως ἀπεπειράθην. Add Eur.Bac.359 μέμηνας ἤδη καὶ πρὶν ἐξέστης φρενῶν (Badham's ἐξεστὼς unnecessary). Perhaps also Apoc.10-7 ὅταν μέλλῃ σαλπίζειν καὶ ἐτελέσθη τὸ μυστήριον, *when he will sound and the mystery will have been fulfilled* (contrary to my note at that place).

21-34 to 22-22. I distrust all this part. It is strange that the chiliarch should have allowed Paul to address the frenzied crowd and thus add fuel to the flames; and stranger still that the crowd should be willing even for a moment to listen to him.* But Luke cannot be

* When addressed by adverse speakers, even such a comparatively unimpassioned body as the House of Commons cannot refrain from uproarious scenes.

responsible for this paradox. The fact of the words *ἐκέλευσεν ἄγεσθαι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν* being repeated in v. 24 points to an interpolator; in my notes on Jn 11-5 and 18-16 to 27 I have shown that such repetitions are a feature in interpolations.

21-35. **βαστάζεσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν.** The Vulgate, followed by the English version, *ut portaretur a militibus.* The correct translation is *that he was held of the soldiers.* Such is the meaning of *βαστῶ* in MGk, as also of *κρατῶ*, which is a synonym; so Vlákhos v. *βαστῶ* 'Bl. *καὶ κρατῶ* (=see also *κρατῶ*).' This synonymity was already in force during Hellenistic times, so that *βαστάζεσθαι* here may be compared with 3-11 *κρατοῦντος αὐτοῦ τὸν Πέτρον.* Apoc.2-1 *ὁ κρατῶν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀστέρας ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ*, etc.

22-3. **πεπαιδευμένος κατὰ ἀκρίβειαν τοῦ πατρῴου νόμου.** Hemsterhuis very plausibly *τὸν πατρῷον νόμον.*

22-5. **ὡς καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς μαρτυρεῖ μοι.** D *μαρτυρήσει*, which is the only apposite reading, for Paul could not say that the chief priest was then bearing witness, but that he would do so if appealed to.

22-15. **ὅτι ἔσῃ μάρτυς αὐτῷ**=*ᾧ ἔσῃ μάρτυς.* See my notes on 10-38. Jn 1-16. Rom.8-29.

22-20. **ὅτε ἐξεχεῖτο τὸ αἷμα Στεφάνου τοῦ μάρτυρός σου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἤμην ἐφεστώς.** The English version adds *also*, giving *καὶ* an intensive or additive force; but it is only the superfluous idiomatic expletive so often encountered in apodoses. Cf. Lk 2-21 *ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν ἡμέραι ὀκτὼ τοῦ περιτεμεῖν αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς.* 2-27 *ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδέξατο*, etc. So is it in MGk when the temporal particle is *μόλις*; Vlákhos v. *μόλις* '*μόλις ἔφθασε καὶ ἀνεχώρησε, à peine arrivé il repartit.*' The Vulgate correctly *cum funderetur sanguis Stephani testis tui, ego astabam.*

22-23. **ῥιπτούντων τὰ ἱμάτια καὶ κονιορτὸν βαλλόντων εἰς τὸν ἀέρα.** Apparently done by way of imprecation. Cf. Nehem.5-13 *τὴν ἀναβολήν μου ἐξετίναξα καὶ εἶπον Οὕτως ἐκτινάξαι ὁ θεὸς πάντα ἄνδρα ὃς οὐ στήσει τὸν λόγον τοῦτον.* Exod.9-10 *ἔλαβε τὴν αἰθάλην καὶ ἔπασεν αὐτὴν Μωυσῆς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐγένετο ἕλκη.*

22-25. **ὡς δὲ προέτειναν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἱμᾶσιν, εἶπε πρὸς τὸν ἑστῶτα ἑκατόνταρχον ὁ Παῦλος εἰ ἄνθρωπον Ῥωμαῖον καὶ ἀκατάκριτον ἔξεστιν ὑμῖν μαστίζειν.** Cf. Oxyr.Pap.1186 *τὸ τὴν διὰ τῶν ἱμάντων αἰκείαν ὑπομένειν*

ἐστὶν μὲν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν δουλικὴν τύχην εἰληχότων ἀνιαρὸν, οὐ μὴν κατὰ τὸ παντελὲς ἀπηγορευμένον, ἐλευθέρους δὲ ἄνδρας τοιαύτην ὕβρειν ὑπομένειν οὔτε τοῖς νόμοις ἀκόλουθον ἀδικείαν τε ἔχον ἐστίν.

προέτειναν. Bentley 'an *παρέτειναν*?'

22-30 to 23-10 (and perhaps to 23-11). An accretion by an unskilful hand, which was suggested by the episode described in Jn 18-19 ff, when Jesus was ill-treated for daring to answer the chief priest. For (1) As Blass justly remarks 'si facinus erat vincire civem Romanum, conveniebat ut tribunus re cognita non postridie sed statim vinctum solveret.' (2) Paul was dragged before the Court with the object of his conduct being investigated, and naturally he was expected to defend himself; and he could not start his defence more mildly, so that there was no cause for his being treated so ignominiously. (3) That he should have called the President *τοῖχε κεκονιαμένε* is unthinkable; this insult is a reminiscence of that addressed to the Pharisees in Mt 23-27 *Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταὶ, ὅτι παρομοιάζετε τάφοις κεκονιαμένοις.* (4) It is impossible that Paul should not recognize the chief priest; his must have been a familiar figure to every citizen of Jerusalem, nor could a man versed in the law as Paul was be unaware of the fact that the Court would be presided over by that dignitary. (5) By his answer in 23-5 *οὐκ ᾔδειν, ἀδελφοὶ, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀρχιερεὺς* Paul is represented as in a subdued mood, whereas in v. 6 by *ἔκραζεν* he all at once assumes a riotous boldness. (6) That the Pharisees, Paul's avowed persecutors, seconded his defence instead of taking advantage of his peril to doom him is out of the question. (7) The words *οὐδὲν κακὸν εὑρίσκομεν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ* are a plagiarism of Pilate's answer in Lk 23-14 *οὐδὲν εὗρον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ αἴτιον.*

The fraud is carried on in 23-26 ff *τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον συλληφθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ μέλλοντα ἀναιρεῖσθαι ὑπ' αὐτῶν, ἐπιστὰς σὺν τῷ στρατεύματι ἐξειλόμην μαθὼν ὅτι Ῥωμαῖος ἐστί. Βουλόμενός τε ἐπιγνῶναι τὴν αἰτίαν δι' ἣν ἐνεκάλουν αὐτῷ κατήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν. Ὃν εὗρον ἐγκαλούμενον περὶ ζητημάτων τοῦ νόμου αὐτῶν, μηδὲν δὲ ἄξιον θανάτου ἢ δεσμῶν ἔγκλημα ἔχοντα. Μηνυθείσης δέ μοι ἐπιβουλῆς εἰς τὸν ἄνδρα ἔσεσθαι, ἐξ αὐτῆς ἔπεμψα πρός σε.* Here the words *βουλόμενός τε* to *ἔγκλημα ἔχοντα* must be supposititious, if such are vv. 22-30 to 23-10. The sentence *ὃν εὗρον ἐγκαλούμενον περὶ ζητημάτων τοῦ νόμου αὐτῶν* is

an evident suggestion from Gallio's answer in 18-15 *εἰ δὲ ζητήματά ἐστι περὶ λόγου καὶ ὀνομάτων καὶ νόμου τοῦ καθ'ὑμᾶς ὄψεσθε αὐτοί.*

Lastly, *ἐπιστὰς σὺν τῷ στρατεύματι* must refer to 21-32 *παραλαβὼν στρατιώτας καὶ ἑκατοντάρχους*. Therefore the following words *μαθὼν ὅτι Ῥωμαῖός ἐστι* are not in their original position, for the fact that Paul was a Roman citizen became known after the chiliarch went down with his troops; their proper place is after *ἔπεμψα πρός σε*, where they would explain that Paul being a Roman citizen was sent away from Jerusalem in order to be saved from the fury of the mob.

23-15. **ἐμφανίσατε τῷ χιλιάρχῳ σὺν τῷ συνεδρίῳ, ὅπως καταγάγῃ αὐτὸν εἰς ὑμᾶς.** Paul was in custody in the Roman camp, where the Sanhedrim had no jurisdiction. Therefore *σὺν τῷ συνεδρίῳ* is not in its proper place; it should follow *τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις* of v.14. Cf. 22-30 *τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ πᾶν τὸ συνέδριον*. Mk 14-55 *οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον*. 15-1 *οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον*.

23-25. **ἐπιστολὴν ἔχουσαν τὸν τύπον τοῦτον.** Markland *τὸν τρόπον*, referring to 1Mac.15-2 (*ἐπιστολαὶ*) *περιέχουσαι τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον*. But cf. from Liddell and Scott Plat.Rep.414a *ὡς ἐν τύπῳ, μὴ δι' ἀκριβείας, εἰρῆσθαι*. Legg.718c *εἰπεῖν οἷόν τινι τύπῳ*, etc. On the contrary, it is more likely that *τύπον* should be substituted for *τρόπον* in 1Mac.15-2.

24-2. **πολλῆς εἰρήνης κτλ.** St Luke pokes fun at the sophists of his day, mimicking their turgid oratory.

24-3. **πάντῃ τε καὶ πανταχοῦ ἀποδεχόμεθα.** An object to *ἀποδεχόμεθα* seems indispensable. Probably *πάντα τε καὶ πανταχῆ, everything and in all ways*. The meaning of *πανταχοῦ* must be *in all places*, as the English version gives; but what have *the places* to do here?

24-11. **δυναμένου σου ἐπιγνῶναι.** Read *δεόμενός σου ἐπιγνῶναι*. Cf. 26-4 *δέομαι μακροθύμως ἀκοῦσαί μου*.

24-13. **οὐδὲ παραστῆσαι δύνανταί σοι περὶ ὧν νῦν κατηγοροῦσί μου.** Supply *μάρτυρας*. Liddell and Scott '*μάρτυρας παρίστανται* Isae.47. 39, etc.; also *παραστήσασθαί τινα, to produce him as witness*, Id.75. 27, Dem.915. 12, etc.'

24-14. **κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν λέγουσιν αἵρεσιν οὕτω λατρεύω.** If the text is sound, the subject of *λέγουσιν* must be impersonal, i.e. *ὁ λαὸς* or something similar. But Paul at that time was not concerned with the

general public; he was countering his accusers who were present and who had just (v. 5) called his faith *αἵρεσιν τῶν Ναζωραίων*. I think therefore that instead of *οὕτω* we should read *οὗτοι*, Paul pointing at his accusers with his finger.

πιστεύων πᾶσι τοῖς κατὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ τοῖς ἐν τοῖς προφήταις γεγραμμένοις. *Believing all that is recorded in the Law and all that is written in the Prophets.* No connexion between *τοῖς κατὰ τὸν νόμον* (see my note on Lk 8-4) and *τοῖς γεγραμμένοις*.

24-20. **ἢ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι εἰπάτωσαν τί εὗρον ἀδίκημα στάντος μου ἐπὶ τοῦ συνεδρίου, ἢ περὶ μιᾶς ταύτης φωνῆς ἧς ἔκραξα ἐν αὐτοῖς ἑστὼς, ὅτι περὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν ἐγὼ κρίνομαι σήμερον ἐφ' ὑμῶν.** A continuation of the interpolation begun at 21-34 and carried on in 22-30ff. It betrays the same lack of skill. It makes Paul beg the question, for his enemies did not attack his doctrine regarding resurrection but complained of his having introduced Gentiles into the temple. Probably this interpolation has usurped the place of some sentence which completed the antecedent clause *τινὲς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἰουδαῖοι, οὓς ἔδει ἐπὶ σοῦ παρεῖναι καὶ κατηγορεῖν εἴ τι ἔχοιεν πρός με.*

24-22. **ὁ Φῆλιξ ἀκριβέστερον εἰδὼς τὰ περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ.** Felix as a Roman was imperfectly acquainted with the new faith, as Gallio was (18-14), and for that very reason he brought his wife, a Jewish lady able to understand and judge, to listen to Paul's outpourings. Accordingly read *ἀνακριβέστερον*; in the same way we have corrected *ἀνακριβῶς* for *ἀκριβῶς* in 18-25. It is another case of the loss of the negative; see my note at that verse.

ὁδοῦ. So did Confucius call his own system.

24-25. **διαλεγομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ (τοῦ Παύλου) περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ τοῦ κρίματος τοῦ μέλλοντος, ἔμφοβος γενόμενος ὁ Φῆλιξ.** Why should Felix have taken any fright? There was no reason, nor does his answer betray anything resembling alarm; on the contrary, he was out for a bribe (v. 26) in full security. Probably *ἔμφοβος γενόμενος* was intruded from a desire to represent Felix's feelings as the same with those of Pilate as stated by Jn 19-8 *ὅτε οὖν ἤκουσεν ὁ Πιλάτος τοῦτον τὸν λόγον, μᾶλλον ἐφοβήθη.*

25-3. **αἰτούμενοι χάριν κατ' αὐτοῦ.** A strange phrase, to explain and defend which even such a thorough scholar as Bloomfield is reduced

to saying that it is a brief form of expression for *αἰτούμενοι χάριν ἐν δίκῃ τῇ κατ'αὐτοῦ*. But why presume such a roundabout locution when C and several other respectable documents provide *παρ'αὐτοῦ*, which is exactly what the context calls for? But I presume the reason is that preference must be given to the more difficult reading, a theory which is perfectly reasonable on the whole, but the application of which can be overdone. The syntax **αἰτεῖν τι παρά τινος** is very common.

25-22. **ἐβουλόμην καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀκοῦσαι.** I.e. *ἐβουλόμην ἄν*. For the omission of *ἄν*, which is met with even in classical texts, see my notes on Rom.9-3 and Jn 7-28.

25-25. **κατελαβόμην μηδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου αὐτὸν πεπραχέναι.** I.e. *οὐ κατελαβόμην τι ἄξιον θανάτου αὐτὸν πεπραχέναι.*

26-16. **μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδες [με] ὧν τε ὀφθήσομαί σοι.** Neither the version *a witness both of those things which thou hast seen and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee,* nor the version *a witness of the things wherein thou hast seen me and of the things wherein I will appear unto thee,* are justified by the text; in fact, even apart from the text both appear to me lame. I believe that *ὧν εἶδες* must indicate the marvels which Paul witnessed in the past and consequently that the subjoined words must indicate that marvels were to be wrought thereafter; if so, *ὀφθήσομαι* must be an error for *ὀφθήσεται*. I may add that St Luke seems to have forgotten the fact that Paul witnessed no other marvel prior to the apparition on his way to Damascus and for a moment to have imagined him as one of the Apostles.

26-24. **τὰ πολλά σε γράμματα εἰς μανίαν περιτρέπει.** Read *παρατρέπει*, i.e. *παραφρονεῖν σε ποιεῖ*. Cf. Paus.4-4 *παρετράπη ὁ Πολυχάρης ἐκ τοῦ νοῦ*. Similarly *παραφέρω, παρασφάλλω, παραπλάζω*. In Hom.ψ 14 *οἵ σέ περ ἔβλαψαν* read *οἵ σε παρέβλαψαν*.

The statement as to Paul being highly educated is discordant with 2Cor.11-6, where Paul calls himself an *ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ*. Cf. also 1Cor.2-4 *ὁ λόγος μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμά μου οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς (?) σοφίας λόγοις*.

26-28. **ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι.** The AV *almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian.* That is the sense required, but the words only yield the absurd meaning *almost*, or *in a little, thou persuadest me to make a Christian.* Read *χριστιανίσαι, to adopt christianity.* The RV *with but little persuasion thou wouldest fain make me a Christian* is fanciful.

27-7. μὴ προσεῶντος ἡμᾶς τοῦ ἀνέμου. Read μὴ πρόσω ἐῶντος (so also Markland), *the wind not permitting us* to steer *ahead*. Cf. 27-13 ἄσσον παρελέγοντο. Paus.5-5-5 οἱ ἄνεμοι ἐπέχουσι τοῦ πρόσω τὸ ὕδωρ. Herod. 9-2 οὐδὲ ἐων ἰέναι ἑκαστέρω, etc.

27-15. μὴ δυναμένου ἀντοφθαλμεῖν τῷ ἀνέμῳ, ἐπιδόντες ἐφερόμεθα. Cf. Lucian,1VH,6 ἐπιτρέψαντες οὖν τῷ πνεύματι καὶ παραδόντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐχειμαζόμεθα. See note on 27-19.

27-17. ὑποζωννύντες τὸ πλοῖον. Qu. ἐπιζωννύντες.

27-19. καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτόχειρες τὴν σκευὴν τοῦ πλοίου ἔρριψαν. From Jon.1-5 καὶ ἐκβολὴν ἐποιήσαντο τῶν σκευῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τοῦ κουφισθῆναι ἀπ'αὐτῶν. Were this passage written by Luke himself, what could we conclude else but that he was romancing? See my notes on 9-7. 10-14. 13-11. 17-18. 17-22. 27-15. 27-40. Possibly, however, the passage is spurious.

27-21. πολλῆς τε ἀσιτίας ὑπαρχούσης. Blass 'non sunt haec bene structa; neque enim in oratione Pauli cibi capiendi mentio fit neque τότε habet quo referatur.' Add that the point of food is taken up by Paul in his subsequent speech vv. 33ff. At this moment what he exhorted his fellow-passengers to was to be of good cheer; cf. 22 τανῦν παραινῶ ὑμᾶς εὐθυμεῖν and 25 διὸ εὐθυμεῖτε. It follows that Luke described them as being in a state of discouragement, the original word being ἀθυμίας. So also Straatman.

27-27. ὑπενόουν οἱ ναῦται προσάγειν τινὰ αὐτοῖς χώραν. I suggest προσαυγάζειν or προσαυγᾶν; the meaning thus would be that the sailors dimly distinguished some land which was dawning in front and appeared to them as a sort of luminous speck in the darkness. With προσαυγάζειν χώραν compare 1Mac.6-39 τὰ ὄρη κατηύγαζεν. The Vulgate *apparere* seems to me to favour such a conjecture. It has been sought to defend the text by assuming an optical delusion on the part of the sailors; but is it at all likely that Luke in a matter-of-fact description would have expressed an approach to land in the form of a delusion? The English version *the shipmen deemed that they drew near to some country* presupposes τινὶ αὐτοὺς χώρᾳ, an excellent reading.

27-33. προσδοκῶντες ἄσιτοι. No doubt προσκαρτεροῦντες ἄσιτοι, *patiently going without nourishment*. Cf. Xen.CP.2-3-13 πρὸς λιμὸν καὶ πρὸς δίψος καὶ πρὸς ῥῖγος καρτερεῖν. Plut.Mor.987e πρὸς δίψαν ἐγκαρτερή-

σαντα. 4Mac.14-9 πάσχοντες ἐνεκαρτέρουν. In view of the context, προσδοκῶντες without an object means nothing.

27-40. κατεῖχον εἰς τὸν αἰγιαλόν· περιπεσόντες δὲ εἰς τόπον διθάλασσον ἐπέκειλαν τὴν ναῦν, καὶ ἡ μὲν πρῶρα ἐρείσασα ἔμεινεν ἀσάλευτος, ἡ δὲ πρύμνα ἐλύετο ὑπὸ τῆς βίας· 44 καὶ οὕτως ἐγένετο πάντας διασωθῆναι ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. There is a curious similarity between this description and that of Lucian,652 πρός τινα ἠϊόνα μαλακὴν ἀπευθύνοντα τὴν ναῦν, οἳ προσενεχθεῖσα ἔμελλεν αὐτὴ μὲν ἠρέμα καὶ κατὰ σχολὴν διαλυθήσεσθαι, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἀσφαλῶς ἀποβήσεσθαι χάριτι (cf. v. 24 κεχάρισταί σοι ὁ θεὸς πάντας τοὺς πλέοντας) καὶ εὐμενείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. See my note on 27-19.

διθάλασσον. *Where two seas met.* Such a detail, however, is of no importance—except perhaps as satisfying the curiosity of geographers—and it is not apparent why it should have been mentioned. But περιπεσόντες shows the author's idea to have been that the ship by ill luck went upon a bad spot, and the word therefore required is one indicative of such a spot. An old Latin translates *vadosum.* This would meet the context, for it would account for the ship having run aground; but I cannot discover which Greek word it represents Qu. λιποθάλασσον; cf. λιπόγεως.

28-3. φρυγάνων. Paspati translates *of brushwood* in accordance with MGk usage as against *of sticks* of the English version. The mistaken acceptation of *sticks* has led to a further inaccuracy in rendering συστρέψαντος by *when Paul had gathered* instead of *when Paul had rolled together.*

28-6. προσεδόκων αὐτὸν μέλλειν (?) πίμπρασθαι ἢ καταπίπτειν ἄφνω νεκρόν. If the barbarians expected Paul to swell, they must have expected him to die also; surely he could not swell and live. Read καὶ καταπίπτειν; and so the Vulgate *existimabant eum in tumorem convertendum et subito casurum et mori.* See my note on 1-18.

PRINTED IN ENGLAND AT
BY JOHN JOHNSON P

NGLAND AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
JOHNSON PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

NOTES ON ST JOHN AND THE APOCALYPSE. 3*s.* net.

A FEW NOTES ON THE GOSPELS ACCORDING TO ST MARK AND ST MATTHEW. Based chiefly on Modern Greek. 5*s.* net.

TO THE ROMANS. A Commentary. 10*s.* 6*d.*

THE TWENTY-SECOND BOOK OF THE ILIAD. With critical notes. 5*s.* net.

ΛΕΚΑ ΑΡΒΑΝΙΤΗ ΜΑΛΛΙΑΡΟΥ ΚΟΥΦΙΑ ΚΑΡΤΑΛΙΑ. Versions in Modern Greek (Euripides, Cyclops; Shakespeare, Merchant of Venice; Thucydides, Book I; passages from Kant, Brugmann, Hans Andersen, &c.). 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE ILIAD TRANSLATED INTO MODERN GREEK. 10*s.* 6*d.*

THE GOSPELS TRANSLATED INTO MODERN GREEK. 5*s.*

SOPHOCLES' ANTIGONE. With a Greek Commentary. *Out of print.*